arXiv:1006.1176v1 [math.OA] 7 Jun 2010

Unified approach to classification of actions of discrete amenable groups on injective factors

Toshihiko MASUDA *
Graduate School of Mathematics, Kyushu University
744, Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka, 819-0395, JAPAN

Abstract

We present a simple unified proof of classification of discrete amenable group actions on injective factors. Our argument does not depend on types of factors. We also show the second cohomology vanishing theorem for arbitrary cocycle crossed actions of discrete amenable groups on the injective factor of type II_1.

1 Introduction

In the theory of operator algebras, the study of automorphism groups and group actions is one of the most important subjects. Especially, since Connes' classification of automorphisms of the injective factor of type II_1 up to outer conjugacy in [6] and [3], classification of discrete amenable group actions on injective factors has been developed by many hands. Namely, in the type II case, V. F. R. Jones classified finite group actions in [16], and A. Ocneanu developed the method of Connes and Jones, and classified general discrete amenable group actions in [32]. In the type III_λ $(\lambda \neq 1)$ case, C. E. Sutherland and M. Takesaki succeed in classification in [38], [39]. In the type III_1 case, classification was obtained by Y. Kawahigashi, Sutherland and Takesaki for finite or abelian group actions [22], and finally by Y. Katayama, Sutherland and Takesaki for arbitrary discrete amenable group actions [19].

Although the classification theorem can be stated in unified way as in [19], proofs presented in the above cited papers heavily depend on type of factors. Indeed, in the type III cases, they reduce the problem to that of the type II case by means of the structure theorem of type III factors. (In this approach, type III_1 case is extremely hard because of lack of classification of $\mathbb{R}$-actions. This the reason why type III_λ $(\lambda \neq 1)$ and III_1 case are treated separately.)

In [29], by developing the Evans-Kishimoto intertwining argument [9], we presented the classification of centrally free actions of discrete amenable groups on injective factors, whose proof is independent from types of factors. So one may expect if he can give a unified approach for classification of general actions by a similar technique. Indeed, for given two actions of a discrete amenable group G with same invariants, if G is a semidirect

---

*Supported by the Grand-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B), JSPS.

product $H \rtimes K$, where H is a centrally trivial part, then we can show the cocycle conjugacy of two actions by using [29]. (See the beginning of §3 for details.)

In this paper, we extend the intertwining argument and present a unified proof of classification of all actions of discrete amenable groups on injective factors. Roughly speaking, we first divide a given action to a centrally trivial part and a centrally free part. It is rather easy to classify centrally trivial parts. By applying the intertwining argument, we classify centrally free parts, and combine centrally free parts and centrally trivial parts. (Similar idea has already appeared in [18] and [38] for classification of groupoid actions.) One difficulty is that a centrally free part does not give an action in the usual sense, and this makes our argument more difficult. So if we take this fact into account, it is more convenient to handle cocycle crossed actions. Thus in the intertwining argument, we also need the second cohomology vanishing procedure. Therefore our argument looks like the mixture of the second cohomology vanishing argument presented in [30] and the intertwining argument. Here we emphasize that our argument is based on the Rohlin type theorem [32] and the characterization of approximately inner automorphisms and centrally trivial automorphisms [5], [22].

This paper is organized as follows. In §2, we recall the definition of invariants of actions and state the main theorem and its corollaries. In §3 we introduce the notion of quasi cocycle crossed actions. In §4, by using ultraproduct, we show that we can approximate a quasi cocycle crossed action by a unitary perturbation of another quasi cocycle crossed action. In §5, we show the approximate cohomology vanishing, which is the main tool for intertwining argument. The key ingredient is the Rohlin type theorem. In §6 we classify quasi cocycle crossed actions, and show the main theorem by applying the extended intertwining argument. In §7, we discuss about construction of model actions. In §8, we treat group actions on subfactors of type II_1 with finite index. By a suitable modification, we can apply the extended intertwining argument in this case. In §9, we apply the intertwining argument to classify outer actions in the sense of [20]. In appendix, we present proofs of the second cohomology vanishing theorem, the Rohlin theorem and the existence of extension of automorphisms to a twisted crossed product von Neumann algebra for readers' convenience.

The author is much indebted to Professor Katayama for improvement of our argument, and express his gratitude. He also thanks Professor Takesaki and Professor Ueda for useful comments on this paper.

2 Preliminaries and main results

Our standard references for theory of operator algebras are [41]. Throughout this paper, M and G always denotes an injective factor, and a discrete amenable group respectively, although some of results are valid for general factors and discrete groups.

Definition 2.1 (1) *Let α be a map from G into $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ with $\alpha_e = \mathrm{id}$ and $v^\alpha(g,h) \in U(M)$, $g, h \in G$, such that $v^\alpha(e,h) = v^\alpha(g,e) = 1$. We say $(\alpha_g, v^\alpha(g,h))$ is a cocycle crossed action of G if it satisfies*

$$\alpha_g \circ \alpha_h = \mathrm{Ad}\, v^\alpha(g,h) \circ \alpha_{gh}, \;\; v^\alpha(g,h)v^\alpha(gh,k) = \alpha_g(v^\alpha(h,k))v^\alpha(g,hk).$$

(2) *Two cocycle crossed actions $(\alpha, v^{\alpha}(g,h))$ and $(\beta, v^{\beta}(g,h))$ are said to be cocycle conjugate if there exist a family of unitaries $\{u_g\}_{g\in G}$ and $\theta \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ such that*

$$\operatorname{Ad} u_g \circ \alpha_g = \theta\circ\beta_g\circ\theta^{-1},\ \ u_g\alpha_g(u_h)v^{\alpha}(g,h)u_{gh}^* = \theta(v^{\beta}(g,h)).$$

If we can take $\theta \in \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M)$, then we say they are strongly cocycle conjugate.

We generalize the invariants of group actions [39], [19] to cocycle crossed action case. Let $\tilde{M}$ be the core for M and $(\tilde{M}, \mathbb{R}, \theta_t)$ the core covariant system [19]. (It is also called the non-commutative flow of weights in [10].) Denote by $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathrm{Aut}(\tilde{M})$ the canonical extension of $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ [13]. Take a faithful normal weight ψ. We can identify $(\tilde{M}, \mathbb{R}, \theta)$ with $(M \rtimes_{\sigma^{\psi}} \mathbb{R}, \widehat{\sigma^{\psi}}_t)$, and $\tilde{\alpha}$ is given by

$$\tilde{\alpha}|_M = \alpha,\ \ \tilde{\alpha}(\lambda_t^{\psi}) = (D\psi\circ\alpha^{-1} : D\psi)_t\lambda_t^{\psi}$$

via this identification, where λ_t^{ψ} is the implementing unitary for σ_t^{ψ}. (See [10] on the functorial property of $(\tilde{M}, \mathbb{R}, \theta_t)$.) Let $\tilde{U}(M)$ be the normalizer unitary group for $M \subset \tilde{M}$. Set

$$\mathrm{Cnt}_r(M) = \{\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(M) \mid \tilde{\sigma} \in \mathrm{Int}(\tilde{M})\} = \{\operatorname{Ad} u|_M \mid u \in \tilde{U}(M)\}.$$

Then the normal subgroup of G defined by $H = \{g \in G \mid \alpha_g \in \mathrm{Cnt}_r(M)\}$ is the first invariant. The second invariant is a Connes-Takesaki module $\mathrm{mod}(\alpha_g) = \tilde{\alpha}_g|_{Z(\tilde{M})}$ [8].

The third invariant is a characteristic invariant. Set $\delta v^{\alpha}(g,n) := v^{\alpha}(g, g^{-1}ng)v^{\alpha}(n,g)^*$ for a 2-cocycle $v^{\alpha}(g,h)$. It is easy to see $\alpha_g\circ\alpha_{g^{-1}ng} = \operatorname{Ad}\delta v^{\alpha}(g,n)\circ\alpha_n\circ\alpha_g$

Take $\tilde{u}_m^{\alpha} \in \tilde{U}(M)$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_m = \operatorname{Ad}\tilde{u}_m^{\alpha}$, $m \in H$, and $\tilde{u}_e = 1$. Comparing

$$\tilde{\alpha}_g\circ\tilde{\alpha}_{g^{-1}ng}\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad}\delta v^{\alpha}(g,n)\circ\tilde{\alpha}_n\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad}(\delta v^{\alpha}(g,n)\tilde{u}_n^{\alpha})$$

with

$$\tilde{\alpha}_g\circ\tilde{\alpha}_{g^{-1}ng}\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad}\tilde{\alpha}_g(\tilde{u}^{\alpha}_{g^{-1}ng}),$$

we get a unitary $\lambda(g,n) \in Z(\tilde{M})$ such that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_g(\tilde{u}^{\alpha}_{g^{-1}ng}) = \lambda(g,n)\delta v^{\alpha}(g,n)\tilde{u}_n^{\alpha}.$$

In a similar way, from $\tilde{\alpha}_m\tilde{\alpha}_n = \operatorname{Ad} v^{\alpha}(m,n)\tilde{\alpha}_{mn}$, we get a unitary $\mu(m,n) \in Z(\tilde{M})$ by

$$\tilde{u}_m^{\alpha}\tilde{u}_n^{\alpha} = \mu(m,n)v^{\alpha}(m,n)\tilde{u}_{mn}^{\alpha},\ m,n \in H.$$

Since θ_t commutes with $\tilde{\alpha}_g$, we get a 1-cocycle $c_t(m) \in Z_{\theta}^1(\mathbb{R}, U(Z(\tilde{M})))$ by $\theta_t(\tilde{u}_m^{\alpha}) = c_t(m)\tilde{u}_m^{\alpha}$. Unitaries (λ, μ) and $c_t(n)$ are related as below.

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta_t(\lambda(g,n))c_t(n) = \mathrm{mod}(\alpha_g)(c_t(g^{-1}ng))\lambda(g,n),\\ &c_t(m)c_t(n)\mu(m,n) = c_t(mn)\theta_t(\mu(m,n)).\end{aligned}$$

Set $\lambda((g,t),n) = \theta_t(\lambda(g,n))c_t(n)$. We extend a cocycle crossed action $(\tilde{\alpha}, v^{\alpha}(g,h))$ of G to that of $\tilde{G} = G \times \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\tilde{\alpha}_{(g,t)} = \tilde{\alpha}_g\theta_t$ and $v^{\alpha}((g,t),(h,s)) = v^{\alpha}(g,h)$. We can verify that (λ, μ) satisfies the following relations. (These include the above relations.)

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu(l,m)\mu(lm,n) = \mu(m,n)\mu(l,mn),\ l,m,n \in H,\\ &\lambda(gh,n) = \tilde{\alpha}_g(\lambda(h,g^{-1}ng))\lambda(g,n),\ g,h \in \tilde{G}, n \in H,\\ &\lambda(g,mn)\lambda(g,m)^*\lambda(g,n)^* = \mu(m,n)\tilde{\alpha}_g(\mu(g^{-1}mg, g^{-1}ng)^*),\ g \in \tilde{G}, m,n \in H,\\ &\lambda(m,n) = \mu(m,m^{-1}nm)\mu(n,m)^*,\ m,n \in H,\\ &\lambda(g,n) = \mu(l,m) = 1 \text{ if any of } g,l,m,n \text{ is } e.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2 (1) *We say* (λ,μ) *satisfying the above conditions as a characteristic cocycle for* α *and denote the set of all characteristic cocycles by* $Z_\alpha(\tilde{G},H,U(Z(\tilde{M})))$. *Note that* $Z_\alpha(G,H,U(Z(\tilde{M})))$ *becomes an abelian group by a natural multiplication.*
(2) *Let* $B_\alpha(\tilde{G},H,U(Z(\tilde{M})))$ *be a set of coboundaries defined as*

$$B_\alpha(\tilde{G},H,U(Z(\tilde{M}))) = \{(\tilde{\alpha}_g(z_{g^{-1}ng})z_n^*, z_m z_n z_{mn}^*) \mid \{z_n\}_{n\in H} \subset U(Z(\tilde{M})),\ z_e = 1\},$$

which is a normal subgroup of $Z_\alpha(\tilde{G},H,U(Z(\tilde{M})))$.
(3) *Let* $\Lambda_\alpha(\tilde{G},H,U(Z(\tilde{M})))$ *be a quotient group. The equivalence class* $\chi(\alpha)=[\lambda,\nu]\in\Lambda_\alpha(\tilde{G},H,U(Z(\tilde{M})))$ *is said to be the characteristic invariant for* α.

Though (λ,μ) depends on the choice of $\tilde{u}_n$, $\chi(\alpha)$ does not depend on $\tilde{u}_n$. Thus the true invariant for α is $\chi(\alpha)$ rather than (λ,μ).

We denote the triplet $\{H, \mathrm{mod}(\alpha_g), \chi(\alpha)\}$ by $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)$. It is a routine work to show $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)$ is a strong cocycle conjugacy invariant. The purpose of this paper is to present a proof the converse implication which does not depend on types of factors by using the Evans-Kishimoto type intertwining argument as in [29].

Theorem 2.3 *Let* M *be an injective factor, and* G *a discrete amenable group. Let* $(\alpha, v^\alpha(g,h))$ *and* $(\beta, v^\beta(g,h))$ *be cocycle crossed actions of* G *on* M *with* $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)=\mathrm{Inv}(\beta)$. *Then* α *and* β *are strongly cocycle conjugate.*

The proof of Theorem 2.3 will be presented in sequel sections. Here we state corollaries of the main theorem.

Let $\mathrm{Aut}_\theta(Z(\tilde{M})) = \{\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}(Z(\tilde{M})) \mid \sigma\theta_t = \theta_t\sigma\}$. Then $\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}_\theta(Z(\tilde{M}))$ acts on $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)$ by $\sigma(\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)) = \{H, \sigma\circ\mathrm{mod}(\alpha_g)\circ\sigma^{-1}, [\sigma(\lambda),\sigma(\mu)]\}$.

Corollary 2.4 *Let* M, G *be as in Theorem 2.3. Let* α *and* β *be actions of* G. *Then* α *and* β *are cocycle conjugate if and only if there exists* $\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}_\theta(Z(\tilde{M}))$ *such that* $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)=\sigma(\mathrm{Inv}(\beta))$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 2.3, $\mathrm{Inv}(\gamma\circ\alpha\circ\gamma^{-1}) = \mathrm{mod}(\gamma)(\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha))$, and the surjectivity of the module map $\gamma\in\mathrm{Aut}(M)\to\mathrm{mod}(\gamma)\in\mathrm{Aut}_\theta(Z(\tilde{M}))$ [40]. □

Since there exists a genuine action β with $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)=\mathrm{Inv}(\beta)$ by [16, Proposition 1.5.8], [39, Theorem 5.14], [22, Proposition 22], the following corollary immediately follows from Theorem 2.3. (Also see §7 about the construction of model actions.)

Corollary 2.5 *The second cohomology vanishing theorem holds for any cocycle crossed action of a discrete amenable group on the injective factor of type* II_1.

Remark. So far, it is known that the second cohomology vanishing theorem holds in the following cases. (See [16], [32], [37].)

(1) arbitrary cocycle crossed actions of free groups on arbitrary von Neumann algebras,

(2) arbitrary cocycle crossed actions of arbitrary locally compact groups on properly infinite von Neumann algebras,

(3) arbitrary cocycle crossed actions of finite groups on type II_1 von Neumann algebras,

(4) centrally free cocycle crossed actions of discrete amenable groups on McDuff factors.

In particular, for infinite discrete amenable groups and the injective factor of type II_1, the second cohomology vanishing theorem has been known for only free cocycle crossed actions. Hence the above corollary removes the assumption of freeness in this case.

We close this section by giving a cohomological explanation of definition of $\chi(\alpha)$ for a cocycle crossed action $(\alpha, v^\alpha(g,h))$. We consider an extended cocycle crossed action $(\tilde{\alpha}, v^\alpha(g,h))$ of $\tilde{G}$ defined as above.

We define a multiplication on $\tilde{U}(M)\times\tilde{G}$ by $(u,g)(w,h) = (u\tilde{\alpha}_g(w)v^\alpha(g,h), gh)$ and denote this group by $\tilde{U}(M)\rtimes_{v^\alpha}\tilde{G}$. Indeed, the 2-cocycle property of $v^\alpha(g,h)$ assures that this multiplication is associative. If an appearing 2-cocycle is clear, then we simply write $\tilde{U}(M)\rtimes\tilde{G}$. We can easily verify $(1,g)(1,g^{-1}ng) = (\delta v^\alpha(g,n), n)(1,g)$.

Let $\bar{H} := \{(u^*, n) \mid n \in H \text{ and } \operatorname{Ad} u = \tilde{\alpha}_n\}$. Then $\bar{H}$ is a normal subgroup of $\tilde{U}(M)\rtimes\tilde{G}$. Indeed, since we have

$$(u^*, m)(w^*, n) = (u^*\tilde{\alpha}_n(w^*)v^\alpha(m,n), mn) = (w^*u^*v^\alpha(m,n), mn)$$

and $\operatorname{Ad}(v^\alpha(m,n)^*uw) = \operatorname{Ad} v^\alpha(m,n)^*\circ\tilde{\alpha}_m\circ\tilde{\alpha}_n = \tilde{\alpha}_{mn}$, $\bar{H}$ is a subgroup. To see $\bar{H}$ is normal, we only have to verify $(w,e)(u^*,n)(w,e)^{-1}$ and $(1,g)(u^*,g^{-1}ng)(1,g)^{-1}$ are in $\bar{H}$. In fact,

$$(w,e)(u^*,n)(w,e)^{-1} = (wu^*, n)(w^*, e) = (wu^*\tilde{\alpha}_n(w^*), n) = (u^*, n)$$

holds. In particular, $\tilde{U}(M)$ are in the commutant of $\bar{H}$.

Next we have the following.

$$(1,g)(u^*, g^{-1}ng)(1,g)^{-1} = (\tilde{\alpha}_g(u^*), e)(1,g)(1,g^{-1}ng)(1,g)^{-1} = (\tilde{\alpha}_g(u^*)\delta v^\alpha(g,n), n),$$

and

$$\operatorname{Ad}(\delta v^\alpha(g,n)^*\tilde{\alpha}_g(u)) = \operatorname{Ad}\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g\circ\operatorname{Ad} u\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad}\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g\circ\tilde{\alpha}_{g^{-1}ng}\circ\tilde{\alpha}_g^{-1} = \tilde{\alpha}_n.$$

Hence $(1,g)(u^*, g^{-1}ng)(1,g)^{-1} \in \bar{H}$.

Although $\{(1,g) \mid g \in G\}$ is not a subgroup of $\tilde{U}(M)\rtimes\tilde{G}$, $(u^*, n) \to (1,g)(u^*,n)(1,g)^{-1}$ defines an action of $\tilde{G}$ on $\bar{H}$ due to $[\tilde{U}(M), \bar{H}] = \{(1,e)\}$.

We have the following $\tilde{G}$-equivariant exact sequence.

$$0 \longrightarrow U(Z(\tilde{M})) \xrightarrow{\iota} \bar{H} \xrightarrow{\pi} H \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here $\iota(z) = (z^*, e) \in \bar{H}$, and $\pi(u^*, n) = n$. The characteristic invariant associated with this exact sequence is nothing but $\chi(\alpha)$. See [16], [39] and [19] for cohomological property of $\chi(\alpha)$.

Remark Let $\tilde{M}\rtimes_{\tilde{\alpha},v}\tilde{G}$ be a twisted crossed product, and λ_g the implementing unitary. The group $\tilde{U}(M)\rtimes G$ is identified with $\{u\lambda_g \mid u \in \tilde{U}(M), g \in G\}$.

3 Quasi cocycle crossed actions

Let α and β be as in Theorem 2.3. In this case, we can choose $\tilde{u}_n^\beta \in U(\tilde{M})$ such that

$$\tilde{\beta}_g(\tilde{u}^\beta_{g^{-1}ng}) = \lambda(g,n)\delta v^\beta(g,n)\tilde{u}^\beta_n,\ \tilde{u}^\beta_m\tilde{u}^\beta_n = \mu(m,n)v^\beta(m,n)\tilde{u}^\beta_{mn},\ \theta_t(\tilde{u}^\beta_m) = c_t(m)\tilde{u}^\beta_m.$$

To explain our idea of proof of Theorem 2.3, consider the following special case. Set $Q = G/H$. Assume that $v^{\alpha}(g,h) = v^{\beta}(g,h) = 1$, and G is of the form $G = H \rtimes Q$. Then $\alpha|_Q$ and $\beta|_Q$ are centrally free actions of Q on M with $\alpha_p \circ \beta_p^{-1} \in \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M)$. By [29], $\mathrm{Ad}\, v_p \circ \alpha_p = \sigma \circ \beta_p \circ \sigma^{-1}$ for some α-cocycle v_p and $\sigma \in \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M)$. Put $v_h = \sigma(\tilde{u}_h^{\beta})\tilde{u}_h^{\alpha *}$ for $h \in H$. By the choice of $\tilde{u}_h^{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{u}_h^{\beta}$, we can verify that $v_h \in \tilde{M}^{\theta} = M$, and v_h is a 1-cocycle for $\alpha|_H$ with $\mathrm{Ad}\, v_h \circ \alpha_h = \sigma \circ \beta_h \circ \sigma^{-1}$. We then define $v_{hp} = v_h \alpha_h(v_p)$ for $h \in H$, $p \in Q$. We can verify $v_p \alpha_p(v_h) = v_{ph}$ for $p \in Q$ and $h \in H$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
v_p \alpha_p(v_h) &= v_p \tilde{\alpha}_p(\sigma(\tilde{u}_h^{\beta})\tilde{u}_h^{\alpha *}) = \sigma \circ \tilde{\beta}_p(\tilde{u}_h^{\beta}) v_p \tilde{\alpha}_p(\tilde{u}_h^{\alpha *}) \\
&= \sigma(\lambda(p, php^{-1})\tilde{u}^{\beta}_{php^{-1}}) v_p \lambda(p, php^{-1})^* \tilde{u}^{\alpha *}_{php^{-1}} \\
&= \sigma(\tilde{u}^{\beta}_{php^{-1}}) v_p \tilde{u}^{\alpha *}_{php^{-1}} = \sigma(\tilde{u}^{\beta}_{php^{-1}}) \tilde{u}^{\alpha *}_{php^{-1}} \alpha_{php^{-1}}(v_p) \\
&= v_{php^{-1}} \alpha_{php^{-1}}(v_p) = v_{ph}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that v_g becomes a 1-cocycle for α and $\mathrm{Ad}\, v_g \circ \alpha_g = \sigma \circ \beta_g \circ \sigma^{-1}$, $g \in G$. Thus α and β are strongly cocycle conjugate.

We would like to extend the above argument to general case. Main difficulty is that G is not a semidirect product of H by Q, that is, we can not embed Q into G as a subgroup. So α does not give an action of Q. To treat such case, we introduce the notion of quasi cocycle crossed cocycle actions of Q. We first classify two quasi cocycle actions of Q by intertwining argument, and combine H-parts and Q-parts as above. In what follows, we mainly use letters g, h, k for elements of G, m, n for those of H, and p, q, r for those of Q.

Lemma 3.1 *Define* $u_m = \tilde{u}_m^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_m^{\beta *}$. *Then* $u_m \in M$ *and we have*

$$\alpha_m = \mathrm{Ad}\, u_m \circ \beta_m, \;\; v^{\alpha}(m,n) = u_m \beta_m(u_n) v^{\beta}(m,n) u_{mn}^*.$$

Proof. By the choice of $\tilde{u}_m^{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{u}_m^{\beta}$, $\theta_t(u_m) = u_m \in \tilde{M}^{\theta} = M$. It is clear $\alpha_m = \mathrm{Ad}\, u_m \circ \beta_m$, since $\tilde{\alpha}_m = \mathrm{Ad}\, u_m \circ \tilde{\beta}_m$. The last equation can be verified as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
u_m \beta_m(u_n) v^{\beta}(m,n) u_{mn}^* &= \tilde{u}_m^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_m^{\beta *} \tilde{\beta}_m(\tilde{u}_n^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_n^{\beta *}) v^{\beta}(m,n) \tilde{u}_{mn}^{\beta} \tilde{u}_{mn}^{\alpha *} \\
&= \tilde{u}_m^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_n^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_n^{\beta *} \tilde{u}_m^{\beta *} v^{\beta}(m,n) \tilde{u}_{mn}^{\beta} \tilde{u}_{mn}^{\alpha *} \\
&= \mu(m,n)^* \tilde{u}_m^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_n^{\alpha} \tilde{u}_{mn}^{\alpha *} \\
&= v^{\alpha}(m,n).
\end{aligned}$$

□

By the above lemma, we can assume $(\alpha_n, v^{\alpha}(m,n)) = (\sigma_n, v^{\sigma}(m,n))$ for some fixed cocycle crossed action σ of H by a suitable unitary perturbation. In fact, the existence of model actions allows us to further assume $v^{\sigma}(m,n) = 1$ for all $m, n \in H$. In what follows, we fix $\tilde{u}_n \in \tilde{U}(M)$ with $\tilde{\sigma}_n = \mathrm{Ad}\, \tilde{u}_n$.

Remark. Let γ_g be a unitary perturbation of α by $w_g \in U(M)$. If we choose $\tilde{u}_n^{\gamma}$ as $w_n \tilde{u}_n^{\alpha}$, then we obtain a same characteristic cocycle.

Fix a section $p \in Q \to \tilde{p} \in G$ with $\tilde{e} = e$, and set $m(p,q) = \widetilde{pq}^{-1}\tilde{p}\tilde{q} \in H$. So $\tilde{p}\tilde{q} = \widetilde{pq} \cdot m(p,q)$ holds. From $(\tilde{p}\tilde{q})\tilde{r} = \tilde{p}(\tilde{q}\tilde{r})$, we obtain $m(pq,r)\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r} = m(p,qr)m(q,r)$. We denote this element by $m(p,q,r)$.

Set $c^{\alpha}(p,q) = v^{\alpha}(\tilde{p},\tilde{q}) v^{\alpha}(\widetilde{pq}, m(p,q))^*$. It is easy to see $\alpha_{\tilde{p}} \circ \alpha_{\tilde{q}} = \mathrm{Ad}\, c^{\alpha}(p,q) \circ \alpha_{\widetilde{pq}} \circ \sigma_{m(p,q)}$.

Definition 3.2 *We say $(\alpha_{\tilde{p}}, c^\alpha(p,q))$ a quasi cocycle crossed action of Q.*

The unitary $c^\alpha(p,q)$ behaves like a 2-cocycle as follows.

Lemma 3.3 *For $p,q,r \in Q$, we have*

$$c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\right) c^\alpha(pq,r) = \alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr).$$

Proof. In $\tilde{U}(M) \rtimes_{v^\alpha} \tilde{G}$, we compute $((1,\tilde{p})(1,\tilde{q}))(1,\tilde{r}) = (1,\tilde{p})((1,\tilde{q})(1,\tilde{r}))$. First note the following relations.

$$(1,\tilde{p})(1,\tilde{q}) = (v^\alpha(\tilde{p},\tilde{q}), \tilde{p}\tilde{q}) = (c^\alpha(p,q), \widetilde{pq})(1, m(p,q)),$$

$$(1,n)(1,g) = (\delta v^\alpha(g,n)^*, e)(1,g)(1,g^{-1}ng).$$

On one hand, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
&((1,\tilde{p})(1,\tilde{q}))(1,\tilde{r}) \\
&\quad= (c^\alpha(p,q), \widetilde{pq})(1,m(p,q))(1,\tilde{r}) \\
&\quad= (c^\alpha(p,q), \widetilde{pq})\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*, e\right)(1,\tilde{r})(1,\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}) \\
&\quad= (c^\alpha(p,q), e)\left(\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\right), e\right)(1,\widetilde{pq})(1,\tilde{r})(1,\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}) \\
&\quad= \left(c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\right) c^\alpha(pq,r), \widetilde{pqr}\right)(1,m(pq,r))(1,\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}) \\
&\quad= \left(c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\right) c^\alpha(pq,r), \widetilde{pqr}\right)(1,m(p,q,r)).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
(1,\tilde{p})((1,\tilde{q})(1,\tilde{r})) &= (1,\tilde{p})(c^\alpha(q,r), \widetilde{qr})(1,m(q,r)) \\
&= (\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r)), e)(1,\tilde{p})(1,\widetilde{qr})(1,m(q,r)) \\
&= (\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr), e)(1,\widetilde{pqr})(1,m(p,qr))(1,m(q,r)) \\
&= (\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr), \widetilde{pqr})(1,m(p,q,r)).
\end{aligned}$$

Note $v^\alpha(m,n) = 1$ for $m,n \in H$. Thus we get the conclusion. $\square$

Remark. If we do not assume $v^\alpha(m,n) = 1$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\right) c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(pq,r), \tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r})) \\
&= \alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(p,qr), m(q,r))).
\end{aligned}$$

4 Approximation of quasi cocycle crossed actions

In the rest of paper, we use the following notation. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)$, $a \in M$ and $\psi \in M_*$, functionals $\alpha(\psi)$, $a \cdot \psi$ and $\psi \cdot a$ are defined as follows.

$$\alpha(\psi) = \psi\circ\alpha^{-1}, \ a\cdot\psi(x) = \psi(xa), \ \psi\cdot a(x) = \psi(ax).$$

Hence $\{\alpha_\nu\}_\nu$ converges to α in the u-topology if $\lim_\nu \|\alpha_\nu(\psi) - \alpha(\psi)\| = 0$ for all $\psi \in M_*$. It is easy to see a norm bounded sequence $\{a_\nu\}_\nu$ converges to a in the σ-strong* topology if and only if

$$\lim_\nu \|(a_\nu - a)\cdot\psi\| = \lim_\nu \|\psi\cdot(a_\nu - a)\| = 0$$

for all $\psi \in M_*$, and equivalently

$$\lim_\nu \|(a_\nu - a)\cdot\varphi\| = \lim_\nu \|\varphi\cdot(a_\nu - a)\| = 0$$

for some fixed faithful normal state φ. The advantage of use of these norms instead of usual norms $\|a\|_\varphi^\#$ defining σ-strong* topology is the unitary invariance of $\|\psi\|$, i.e., $\|u\cdot\psi\cdot v\| = \|\psi\|$ for $\psi \in M_*$, $u, v \in U(M)$.

Throughout this paper, we fix a free ultrafilter ω over $\mathbb{N}$. Let M^ω be an ultraproduct algebra [32], and M_ω a central sequence algebra [31], [2]. By the Connes-Krieger-Haagerup classification of injective factors [4], [24], [7], [12], M is a McDuff factor. Hence M_ω is of type II$_1$. Let $\tau^\omega : M^\omega \to M$ be a positive map $\tau^\omega(X) = \lim_{\nu\to\omega} x_\nu$, $X = (x_\nu) \in M^\omega$, where limit is taken in the σ-weak topology. We extend $\varphi \in M_*$ to $(M^\omega)_*$ by $\varphi(X) = \varphi\circ\tau^\omega(X)$. The restriction $\tau_\omega = \tau^\omega|M_\omega$ gives a tracial state on M_ω. We denote the L^1-norm $\tau_\omega(|X|)$ on M_ω by $|X|_1$. We write $A \Subset B$ if A is a finite subset of B.

Let α and β be as in the previous section. By [22, Theorem 1], $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{mod}) = \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M)$, and $\mathrm{Cnt}_r(M) = \mathrm{Cnt}(M)$ for an injective factor M, where $\mathrm{Cnt}(M)$ is the set of centrally trivial automorphisms. Hence there exists a sequence of unitaries $\{u_{\tilde r}^\nu\}_\nu \subset M$, $r \in Q$, such that $\alpha_{\tilde r} = \lim_\nu u_{\tilde r}^\nu \beta_{\tilde r}$, and $\alpha_{\tilde r}$ and $\beta_{\tilde r}$ induce free actions of Q on M_ω. However to apply the intertwining argument in our setting, we also need to approximate 2-cocycles of α and β. This section is devoted to solve this problem. Our goal in this section is Lemma 4.6.

Let $\{u_{\tilde r}^\nu\} \subset M$ be as above, and set $U_{\tilde r} = (u_{\tilde r}^\nu) \in M^\omega$. We have $\alpha_{\tilde r} = \mathrm{Ad}\, U_{\tilde r}\circ\beta_{\tilde r}$ on M. We want to extend $U_{\tilde r}$ for all $g \in G$ so that $\alpha_g = \mathrm{Ad}\, U_g\circ\beta_g$ on M. It is easy to see two unitaries $v^\alpha(n,\tilde r)\sigma_n(U_{\tilde r})v^\beta(n,\tilde r)^*$ and $v^\alpha(\tilde r, \tilde r^{-1}n\tilde r)^* U_{\tilde r} v^\beta(\tilde r, \tilde r^{-1}n\tilde r)$ have the desired property for $\alpha_{n\tilde r}$ and $\beta_{n\tilde r}$. The following lemma says that these two unitaries coincide.

Lemma 4.1 *For any $W_g = (w_g^\nu) \in M^\omega$ with $\alpha_g = \lim_{\nu\to\omega} w_g^\nu\circ\beta_g$, we have*

$$v^\alpha(n,g)^*\sigma_n(W_g)v^\beta(n,g) = v^\alpha(g, g^{-1}ng)^* W_g v^\beta(g, g^{-1}ng)$$

for $g \in G$ and $n \in H$.

Proof. We will show $W_g^*\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\sigma_n(W_g) = \delta v^\beta(g,n)$. Since the canonical extension is continuous in the u-topology, we have $\lim_{\nu\to\omega} \mathrm{Ad}\, w_g^\nu\circ\tilde\beta_g = \tilde\alpha_g$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\nu\to\omega} w_g^{\nu *}\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\sigma_n(w_g^\nu) &= \lim_{\nu\to\omega} w_g^{\nu *}\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\tilde\sigma_n(w_g^\nu) = \lim_{\nu\to\omega} w_g^{\nu *}\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\tilde u_n w_g^\nu \tilde u_n^* \\ &= \tilde\beta_g\circ\tilde\alpha_g^{-1}\left(\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\tilde u_n\right)\tilde u_n^* = \lambda(g,n)^*\tilde\beta_g\left(\tilde u_{g^{-1}ng}\right)\tilde u_n^* \\ &= \delta v^\beta(g,n).\end{aligned}$$

Here note $\tilde\beta_g\circ\tilde\alpha_g^{-1}(\lambda(g,n)) = \lambda(g,n)$, since $\mathrm{mod}(\alpha_g) = \mathrm{mod}(\beta_g)$. □

Define $U_{n\tilde r} = v^\alpha(n,\tilde r)\sigma_n(U_{\tilde r})v^\beta(n,\tilde r)^*$, $\gamma_g = \mathrm{Ad}\, U_g\circ\beta_g$, $V(g,h) = U_g\beta_g(U_h)v^\beta(g,h)U_{gh}^*$. Then $(\gamma_g, V(g,h))$ is a cocycle crossed action on M^ω with $\gamma_g|_M = \alpha_g$. Note $V(m,n) = 1$, $m, n \in H$, since $U_n = 1$ for $n \in H$. Our first task is to show that $\gamma_{\tilde p}$ is a free cocycle crossed action of Q on M_ω.

Lemma 4.2 *For $g \in G$ and $n \in H$, we have $V(n,g) = v^\alpha(n,g)$ and $V(g,n) = v^\alpha(g,n)$.*

Proof. From the definition of $U_{n\tilde{r}}$, it follows that

$$V(n,\tilde{r}) = \sigma_n(U_{\tilde{r}})v^\beta(n,\tilde{r})U_{n\tilde{r}}^* = \sigma_n(U_{\tilde{r}})v^\beta(n,\tilde{r})v^\beta(n,\tilde{r})^*\sigma_n(U_{\tilde{r}}^*)v^\alpha(n,\tilde{r}) = v^\alpha(n,\tilde{r}).$$

By Lemma 4.1, we have $U_{\tilde{r}n} = U_{\tilde{r}n\tilde{r}^{-1}n} = v^\alpha(\tilde{r},n)^*U_{\tilde{r}}v^\beta(\tilde{r},n)$. Hence

$$V(\tilde{r},n) = U_{\tilde{r}}v^\beta(\tilde{r},n)U_{\tilde{r}n}^* = U_{\tilde{r}}v^\beta(\tilde{r},n)v^\beta(\tilde{r},n)^*U_{\tilde{r}}^*v^\alpha(\tilde{r},n) = v^\alpha(\tilde{r},n)$$

holds. If $g = m\tilde{r}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} V(n,g) &= V(n,m\tilde{r}) = \sigma_n(V(m,\tilde{r})^*)V(n,m)V(nm,\tilde{r}) \\ &= \sigma_n(v^\alpha(m,\tilde{r})^*)v^\alpha(nm,\tilde{r}) = v^\alpha(n,m\tilde{r}) = v^\alpha(n,g) \end{aligned}$$

holds. In a similar way as above, we can verify $V(\tilde{r}m,n) = v^\alpha(\tilde{r}m,n)$. □

Lemma 4.3 *Put* $z(p,q) = U_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(U_{\tilde{q}})c^\beta(p,q)U_{\widetilde{pq}}^*c^\alpha(p,q)^*$, $p,q \in Q$. *Then* $z(p,q) \in M_\omega$.

Proof. For two sequences $\{\psi_\nu\}$, $\{\varphi_\nu\} \subset M_*$, we write $\psi_\nu \sim \varphi_\nu$ if $\lim_{\nu\to\omega}\|\psi_\nu - \varphi_\nu\| = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\tilde{p}}\circ\alpha_{\tilde{q}}(\varphi) &\sim \operatorname{Ad} u_{\tilde{p}}^\nu\beta_{\tilde{p}}(u_{\tilde{q}}^\nu)\circ\beta_{\tilde{p}}\circ\beta_{\tilde{q}}(\varphi) \\ &= \operatorname{Ad}\left(u_{\tilde{p}}^\nu\beta_{\tilde{p}}(u_{\tilde{q}}^\nu)c^\beta(p,q)\right)\circ\beta_{\widetilde{pq}}\circ\sigma_{m(p,q)}(\varphi) \\ &\sim \operatorname{Ad}\left(u_{\tilde{p}}^\nu\beta_{\tilde{p}}(u_{\tilde{q}}^\nu)c^\beta(p,q)u_{\widetilde{pq}}^{\nu*}\right)\circ\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\circ\sigma_{m(p,q)}(\varphi) \\ &= \operatorname{Ad}\left(u_{\tilde{p}}^\nu\beta_{\tilde{p}}(u_{\tilde{q}}^\nu)c^\beta(p,q)u_{\widetilde{pq}}^{\nu*}c^\alpha(p,q)^*\right)\circ\alpha_{\tilde{p}}\circ\alpha_{\tilde{q}}(\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

holds. This implies $U_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(U_{\tilde{q}})c^\beta(p,q)U_{\widetilde{pq}}^*c^\alpha(p,q)^* \in M_\omega$. □

Lemma 4.4 $(\gamma_{\tilde{p}}, z(p,q))$ *is a cocycle crossed action of* Q *on* M_ω.

Proof. Set $z'(p,q) = V(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})V(\widetilde{pq},m(p,q))^* = U_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(U_{\tilde{q}})c^\beta(p,q)U_{\widetilde{pq}}^*$. Then $(\gamma_{\tilde{p}}, z'(p,q))$ is a quasi cocycle crossed action of Q, and $z'(p,q) = z(p,q)c^\alpha(p,q)$.

For $x \in M_\omega$, we have

$$\gamma_{\tilde{p}}\circ\gamma_{\tilde{q}}(x) = \operatorname{Ad} z'(p,q)\circ\gamma_{\widetilde{pq}}\circ\sigma_{m(p,q)}(x) = \operatorname{Ad} z(p,q)\circ\gamma_{\widetilde{pq}}(x),$$

since $\operatorname{Ad} c^\alpha(p,q), \sigma_{m(p,q)} \in \operatorname{Cnt}(M)$.

We next show that $z(p,q)$ satisfies the 2-cocycle relation. By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$z'(p,q)\gamma_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta V(\tilde{r},m(p,q))^*\right)z'(pq,r) = \gamma_{\tilde{p}}(z'(q,r))z'(p,qr).$$

By Lemma 4.2 and $\gamma_g|_M = \alpha_g$, the left hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} &z'(p,q)\gamma_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta V\left(\tilde{r},m(p,q)\right)^*\right)z'(pq,r) \\ &\quad= z(p,q)c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},m(p,q))^*\right)z(pq,r)c^\alpha(pq,r) \\ &\quad= z(p,q)z(pq,r)c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},m(p,q))^*\right)c^\alpha(pq,r). \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\tilde{p}}(z'(q,r))z'(p,qr) &= \gamma_{\tilde{p}}(z(q,r)c^\alpha(q,r))z(p,qr)c^\alpha(p,qr) \\ &= \gamma_{\tilde{p}}(z(q,r))z(p,qr)\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr). \end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 3.3 yields $z(p,q)z(pq,r) = \gamma_{\tilde{p}}(z(q,r))z(p,qr)$. □

Next step is to replace U_p so that $z(p,q) = 1$. To this end, we need the second cohomology vanishing theorem.

Proposition 4.5 *Let Q be a discrete amenable group, and $(\gamma, u(g,h))$ a semiliftable cocycle crossed action of Q on M_ω. Then $u(g,h)$ is a coboundary.*

Proposition 4.5 was first proved by Ocneanu [32], and later more simplified proof was given in [30] with generalization to discrete amenable Kac algebra case. In appendix, we present a proof of Proposition 4.5 based on the argument in [30] for readers' convenience.

Lemma 4.6 *Let α and β be as above. Then there exists a sequence $\{u_p^\nu\}_\nu \subset U(M)$, $p \in Q$, such that*
(1) $\alpha_{\tilde{p}} = \lim_{\nu\to\omega} \mathrm{Ad}\, u_p^\nu \circ \beta_{\tilde{p}}$ in the u-topology,
(2) $c^\alpha(p,q) = \lim_{\nu\to\omega} u_p^\nu \beta_{\tilde{p}}(u_q^\nu) c^\beta(p,q) u_{pq}^{\nu *}$ in the σ-strong* topology.

Proof. Let $(\gamma_{\tilde{p}}, z(p,q))$ be as in Lemma 4.4. By Proposition 4.5, there exists $a_p \in U(M_\omega)$ such that $a_p\gamma_{\tilde{p}}(a_q)z(p,q)a_{pq}^* = 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= a_p\gamma_{\tilde{p}}(a_q)z(p,q)a_{pq}^* = a_pU_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(a_q)U_{\tilde{p}}^*U_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(U_{\tilde{q}})c^\beta(p,q)U_{\widetilde{pq}}^*c^\alpha(p,q)^*a_{pq}^* \\ &= a_pU_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(a_qU_{\tilde{q}})c^\beta(p,q)U_{\widetilde{pq}}^*a_{pq}^*c^\alpha(p,q)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the representing sequence of $a_pU_{\tilde{p}}$ is a desired one. □

The following lemma is unnecessary in the rest of this paper. However the similar argument will be appear in the proof of main theorem in §6.

Lemma 4.7 *Let $U_{\tilde{p}} = (u_p^\nu) \in M^\omega$ be as in Lemma 4.6. Then we have $V(g,h) = v^\alpha(g,h)$ for all $g,h \in G$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, we have

$$v^\alpha(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})v^\alpha(\widetilde{pq},m(p,q))^* = c^\alpha(p,q) = U_{\tilde{p}}\beta_{\tilde{p}}(U_{\tilde{q}})c^\beta(p,q)U_{\widetilde{pq}}^* = V(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})V(\widetilde{pq},m(p,q))^*.$$

Then by Lemma 4.2, we have $V(\tilde{p},\tilde{q}) = v^\alpha(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})$. If $g = m\tilde{p}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} V(g,\tilde{q}) &= V(m\tilde{p},\tilde{q}) = V(m,\tilde{p})^*\sigma_m\left(V(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})\right)V(m,\tilde{p}\tilde{q}) \\ &= v^\alpha(m,\tilde{p})^*\sigma_m(v^\alpha(\tilde{p},\tilde{q}))v^\alpha(m,\tilde{p}\tilde{q}) = v^\alpha(m\tilde{p},\tilde{q}) = v^\alpha(g,\tilde{q}) \end{aligned}$$

holds. For $h = n\tilde{q}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(g,h) &= V(g,n\tilde{q}) = \gamma_g(V(n,\tilde{q})^*)V(g,n)V(gn,\tilde{q}) \\ &= \alpha_g(v^\alpha(n,\tilde{q})^*)v^\alpha(g,n)v^\alpha(gn,\tilde{q}) = v^\alpha(g,n\tilde{q}) = v^\alpha(g,h) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.2 and the above result. □

5 Approximate cohomology vanishing

Let K be a discrete amenable group. Let $F \Subset K$ and $\delta > 0$. In this paper, we say $S \Subset K$ is (F,δ)-invariant if

$$\left| S \cap \bigcap_{g\in F} g^{-1}S \right| > (1-\delta)|S|.$$

We will use the following Rohlin type theorem to show approximate cohomology vanishing.

Theorem 5.1 *Let K be a discrete amenable group, and γ_g a semiliftable strongly free action of K on M_ω. Fix $e \in F \Subset K$, $\delta > 0$, and let $S \Subset K$ be an (F,δ)-invariant finite set. Then there exists a partition of unity $\{E_s\}_{s\in S} \subset M_\omega$ such that*

$$\sum_{s\in g^{-1}S\cap S} |\gamma_g(E_s) - E_{gs}|_1 < 4\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \ \ g \in F,$$

$$\sum_{s\in S\setminus g^{-1}S} |E_s|_1 < 3\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \ \ g \in F,$$

$$[\gamma_g(E_s), E_{s'}] = 0, \ \ g \in F, \ s, s' \in S.$$

Moreover we can take $\{E_s\}$ in the relative commutant of any countable subset of M_ω.

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is essentially same as that of [32, Theorem 6.1]. (See Appendix for detail of proof.) Since we do not need a paving structure of a discrete amenable group, our Rohlin type theorem takes a simpler form than Ocneanu's one.

The following lemma is the key for our intertwining argument in the next section.

Lemma 5.2 *Let K be a discrete amenable group. Assume $F \Subset K$, $\Psi \Subset M_*$, $\Phi \Subset (M_*)_+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are given. Let S be an (F,ε)-invariant finite set. Let γ be a map from K into* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *such that $\gamma_{gh} \equiv \gamma_g\gamma_h$, and $\gamma_g \not\equiv \mathrm{id}$ for $g \neq e$, modulo* $\mathrm{Cnt}(M)$. *Assume that a family of unitaries $\{u_g\}_{g\in K} \subset U(M)$ satisfies*

$$\|[\psi, u_s]\| < (3|S|)^{-1}\varepsilon, \ \ s \in S, \ \psi \in \Psi,$$

$$\|\varphi \cdot (u_g\gamma_g(u_s)u_{gs}^* - 1)\| < 5\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \ \ \|(u_g\gamma_g(u_s)u_{gs}^* - 1)\cdot\varphi\| < 5\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \ \ \varphi \in \Phi, \ g \in F, \ s \in S.$$

Then there exists $w \in U(M)$ such that

$$\|[w, \psi]\| < \varepsilon, \ \ \psi \in \Psi,$$

$$\|(u_g\gamma_g(w)w^* - 1)\cdot\varphi\| < 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}, \ \|\varphi\cdot(u_g\gamma_g(w)w^* - 1)\| < 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}, \ g \in F, \ \varphi \in \Phi.$$

Proof. By assumption, γ induces a free action of K on M_ω. Let $\{E_s\}_{s\in S} \subset M_\omega$ be Rohlin projections for γ_g as in Theorem 5.1. Set $W = \sum_{h\in S} u_hE_h \in U(M^\omega)$. Note $|\sum_i x_ip_i| = \sum_i |x_i|p_i$ for $x_k \in M$ and a partition of unity $\{p_i\} \subset M_\omega$, and $\varphi(ab) = \varphi(a)\tau_\omega(b)$ for $a \in M$ and $b \in M_\omega$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi\left(|u_g\gamma_g(W)W^* - 1|\right) &= \varphi\left(\left|\sum_{h,k\in S}(u_g\gamma_g(u_h)u_k^* - 1)\gamma_g(E_h)E_k\right|\right) \\
&= \sum_{h,k\in S}\varphi\left(|u_g\gamma_g(u_h)u_k^* - 1|\,\gamma_g(E_h)E_k\right) \\
&= \sum_{h,k\in S}\varphi\left(|u_g\gamma_g(u_h)u_k^* - 1|\right)|\gamma_g(E_h)E_k|_1 .
\end{aligned}$$

We divide $\sum_{h,k\in S}$ as

$$\sum_{h,k\in S} = \sum_{\substack{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S\\ k\in S}} + \sum_{\substack{h\in S\setminus g^{-1}S\\ k\in S}} = \sum_{\substack{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S\\ gh=k\in S}} + \sum_{\substack{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S\\ gh\neq k\in S}} + \sum_{\substack{h\in S\setminus g^{-1}S\\ k\in S}} .$$

Since $\varphi(|x|) \leq \|x \cdot \varphi\|$, the first term is less than $5\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ by the assumption. The second term is estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S\\ k\in S, k\neq gh}} \varphi\left(|(u_g\gamma_g(u_h)u_k^*-1)|\right)|\gamma_g(E_h)E_k|_1 &\leq 2\sum_{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S}|(1-E_{gh})\gamma_g(E_h)|_1\\ &= 2\sum_{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S}|(1-E_{gh})(\gamma_g(E_h)-E_{gh})|_1\\ &< 8\sqrt{\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

The third term is estimated as follows

$$\sum_{\substack{h\in S\setminus g^{-1}S\\ k\in S}} \varphi\left(|u_g\gamma_g(u_h)u_k^*-1|\right)\left|\gamma_g(E_h)E_k\right|_1 \leq \sum_{h\in S\setminus g^{-1}S} 2|\gamma_g(E_h)| < 6\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Hence we obtain $\varphi\left(|u_g\gamma_g(W)W^*-1|\right) < 19\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, $g \in F$. In the same way, we have $\varphi\left(|(u_g\gamma_g(W)W^*-1)^*|\right) < 19\sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

Let $W = (w_\nu)_\nu$, $E_s = (e_{s,\nu})_\nu$ be representing sequences consisting of unitaries, and projections respectively. Set $a_\nu = \sum_{s\in S} u_s e_{s,\nu}$. Note that a_ν is not a unitary in general. Since $(a_\nu) = (w_\nu)$ in M^ω, $a_\nu - w_\nu$ converges to 0 in the σ-strong* topology as $\nu \to \omega$.

Fix sufficiently large ν such that

$$\|[\psi, w_\nu - a_\nu]\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3},\ \|[\psi, e_{s,\nu}]\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3|S|},\ \psi \in \Psi, s \in S,$$

$$\varphi(|u_g\gamma_g(w_\nu)w_\nu^*-1|) < 19\sqrt{\varepsilon},\ \varphi(|(u_g\gamma_g(w_\nu)w_\nu^*-1)^*|) < 19\sqrt{\varepsilon},\ g\in F,\ \varphi\in\Phi.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|[\psi, w_\nu]\| &\leq \|[\psi, w_\nu - a_\nu]\| + \|[\psi, a_\nu]\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \left\|\left[\psi, \sum_{k\in S} u_k e_{k,\nu}\right]\right\|\\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \sum_{k\in S}\left(\|[\psi, u_k]e_{k,\nu}\| + \|u_k[\psi, e_{k,\nu}]\|\right) < \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|x\cdot\varphi\| \leq \sqrt{\|x\|\varphi(|x|)}$ and $\|\varphi\cdot x\| \leq \sqrt{\|x\|\varphi(|x^*|)}$, $w = w_\nu$ is a desired unitary. □

6 Intertwining argument

In this section, we present a proof of the main theorem, Theorem 2.3. We can assume β is an action, i.e., $v^\beta(g,h) = 1$, $g, h \in G$ due to the existence of model actions. Recall that we assumed that $\sigma_n = \alpha_n = \beta_n$ is an action of H, and fixed a unitary $\tilde{u}_m \in \tilde{M}$ with $\tilde{\sigma}_m = \operatorname{Ad}\tilde{u}_m$ in §3.

At first, we will classify two quasi cocycle crossed actions $(\alpha_{\tilde{p}}, c^\alpha(p,q))$ and $(\beta_{\tilde{p}}, 1)$ of Q. For simplicity, we write $\alpha_{\tilde{p}}$ as α_p until the end of proof of Theorem 6.1.

Theorem 6.1 *Let $(\alpha_p, c^\alpha(p,q))$ and $(\beta_p, 1)$ as above. Then there exist $\bar{\theta}_0$, $\bar{\theta}_1 \in \overline{\operatorname{Int}}(M)$, $\hat{u}_p^0$, $\hat{u}_p^1 \in U(M)$ such that*

$$\operatorname{Ad}\hat{u}_p^0\circ\bar{\theta}_0\circ\alpha_p\circ\bar{\theta}_0^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad}\hat{u}_p^1\circ\bar{\theta}_1\circ\beta_p\circ\bar{\theta}_1^{-1},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{u}^0_p\bar{\theta}_0\circ\alpha_p\circ\bar{\theta}_0^{-1}(\hat{u}^0_q)\bar{\theta}_0(c^{\alpha}(p,q))\bar{\theta}_0\circ\alpha_{pq}\circ\bar{\theta}_0^{-1}(\bar{\theta}_0(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)})\hat{u}^{0*}_{pq}\\ &\quad=\hat{u}^1_p\bar{\theta}_1\circ\beta_p\circ\bar{\theta}_1^{-1}(\hat{u}^1_q)\bar{\theta}_1\circ\beta_{pq}\circ\bar{\theta}_1^{-1}(\bar{\theta}_1(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)})\hat{u}^{1*}_{pq}.\end{aligned}$$

We remark that $\bar{\theta}_i(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)}$, $i=0,1$, are indeed in M.

Proof. Put $\varepsilon_n = 4^{-n}$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$. (Until the end of proof, we use the letter n to denote elements in $\mathbb{N}$.) Fix $F_n \Subset Q$ and an (F_n,ε_n)-invariant set $S_n\Subset Q$ such that $e\in F_1$, $F_n\subset F_{n+1}$, $\bigcup_n F_n = Q$, $F_n\subset S_n$ and $F_nS_n\subset F_{n+1}$.

Fix a faithful normal state φ_0. Let $\{\Psi_n\}_n$ be an increasing sequence of finite sets of M_* such that $\bigcup_n \Psi_n$ is total in M_*.

Set $\gamma^{(0)}=\alpha$, $c^0(p,q)=c^{\alpha}(p,q)$, $\gamma^{(-1)}=\beta$, $c^{-1}(p,q)=1$. We will construct a family of quasi cocycle crossed actions $(\gamma^{(n)}_p, c^n(p,q))$, unitaries u^n_p, a^n_p, b^n_p, w_n, automorphisms θ_n, and finite sets $\Phi_n\Subset (M_*)_+$, $\Psi'_n,\Phi'_n\Subset M_*$ satisfying the following conditions.

$$(n.1)\quad \Phi_n=\{\mathrm{Ad}\, b^{n-1}_p(\varphi_0)\}_{p\in F_n},\ \Phi'_n=\bigcup_{\substack{p,q\in F_n\\ r\in S_n,\varphi\in\Phi_n}}\left(\gamma^{(n-1)}_p\right)^{-1}\left(\{\varphi\cdot c^{n-1}(q,r), c^{n-1}(q,r)\cdot\varphi\}\right),$$

$$(n.2)\quad \Psi'_n=\Psi_n\cup\theta_{n-1}(\Psi_n)\cup\bigcup_{p\in F_n}\{b^{n-1}_p\cdot\varphi_0,\varphi_0\cdot b^{n-1}_p\}\cup\Phi'_n,$$

$$(n.3)\quad a^n_p=u^n_p\gamma^{(n-2)}_p(w_n)w^*_n,\ b^n_p=a^n_pw_nb^{n-2}_pw^*_n,\ \theta_n=\mathrm{Ad}\, w_n\circ\theta_{n-2},\ n\geq 3,$$

$$(n.4)\quad \gamma^{(n)}_p=\mathrm{Ad}\, u^n_p\circ\gamma^{(n-2)}_p=\mathrm{Ad}\, a^n_p\circ\mathrm{Ad}\, w_n\circ\gamma^{(n-2)}_p\circ\mathrm{Ad}\, w^*_n,$$

$$(n.5)\quad c^n(p,q)=u^n_p\gamma^{(n-2)}_p(u^n_q)c^{n-2}(p,q)u^{n*}_{pq},$$

$$\begin{aligned}(n.6)\quad &\|\gamma^{(n)}_p(\psi)-\gamma^{(n-1)}_p(\psi)\|<\frac{\varepsilon_n}{6|S_n|},\ p\in F_{n+1},\\ &\psi\in\bigcup_{q\in F_{n+1}}\left(\gamma^{(n-2)}_q\right)^{-1}(\Psi'_{n-1})\cup\left(\gamma^{(n-1)}_q\right)^{-1}(\Psi'_n),\end{aligned}$$

$$(n.7)\quad\begin{cases}\|\varphi\cdot\left(c^n(p,q)-c^{n-1}(p,q)\right)\|<\dfrac{\varepsilon_n}{2},\\ \|\left(c^n(p,q)-c^{n-1}(p,q)\right)\cdot\varphi\|<\dfrac{\varepsilon_n}{2},\quad \varphi\in\Phi_n\cup\Phi_{n-1},\, p\in F_n,\, q\in S_n,\end{cases}$$

$$(n.8)\quad\begin{cases}\|\varphi\cdot(a^n_p-1)\|<7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n-1}},\\ \|(a^n_p-1)\cdot\varphi\|<7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n-1}},\quad \varphi\in\Phi_{n-1},\, p\in F_{n-1},\, n\geq 2,\end{cases}$$

$$(n.9)\quad \|[w_n,\psi]\|<\varepsilon_{n-1},\ \psi\in\Psi'_{n-1},\ n\geq 2.$$

Step 1. Define Φ_1, Φ'_1 and Ψ'_1 as in (1.1) and (1.2). (Here we set $b^0_p=1$, $\theta_0=\mathrm{id}$ and $\Psi_0=\Phi_0=\emptyset$.) By Lemma 4.6, there exists a unitary u^1_p such that

$$(1.a)\quad \left\|\mathrm{Ad}\, u^1_p\circ\gamma^{(-1)}_p(\psi)-\gamma^{(0)}_p(\psi)\right\|<\frac{\varepsilon_1}{6|S_1|},\ p\in F_2,\ \psi\in\bigcup_{r\in F_2}\left(\gamma^{(0)}_r\right)^{-1}(\Psi'_1),$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1.b)\quad &\left\|\varphi\cdot\left(u^1_p\gamma^{(-1)}_p(u^1_q)u^{1*}_{pq}-c^0(p,q)\right)\right\|<\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2},\ \left\|\left(u^1_p\gamma^{(-1)}_p(u^1_q)u^{1*}_{pq}-c^0(p,q)\right)\cdot\varphi\right\|<\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2},\\ &p\in F_1,\ q\in S_1,\ \varphi\in\Phi_1.\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$w_1 = 1,\ u_p^1 = a_p^1 = u_p^1,\ \theta_1 = \operatorname{Ad} w_1,\ \gamma_p^{(1)} = \operatorname{Ad} u_p^1 \circ \gamma_p^{(-1)},\ c^1(p,q) = u_p^1 \gamma_p^{(-1)}(u_q) u_{pq}^{1*}.$$

Then we obtain (1.3), (1.4) and (1.5). The conditions (1.6) and (1.7) follow from (1.a) and (1.b). Hence the first step is complete.

Suppose we have constructed up to the $(n-1)$-st step.

Step n. Define Φ_n, Φ'_n and Ψ'_n as in (n.1) and (n.2). By Lemma 4.6, there exists a unitary u_p^n such that

$$(n.a)\quad \left\| \operatorname{Ad} u_p^n \circ \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(\psi) - \gamma_p^{(n-1)}(\psi) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{6|S_n|},$$
$$p \in F_{n+1},\ \psi \in \bigcup_{q \in F_{n+1}} (\gamma_q^{(n-2)})^{-1}(\Psi'_{n-1}) \cup (\gamma_q^{(n-1)})^{-1}(\Psi'_n),$$

$$(n.b)\quad \left\| \varphi \cdot \left(u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^{n*} - c^{n-1}(p,q) \right) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2},$$
$$\left\| \left(u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^{n*} - c^{n-1}(p,q) \right) \cdot \varphi \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2},$$
$$p \in F_n,\ q \in S_n,\ \varphi \in \Phi_n \cup \Phi_{n-1}.$$

By ($n.a$) and ($n-1.6$), we get

$$\left\| \operatorname{Ad} u_p^n \circ \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(\psi) - \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(\psi) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{3|S_{n-1}|},\ \ \psi \in \bigcup_{q \in F_n} (\gamma_q^{(n-2)})^{-1}(\Psi'_{n-1}),\ \ p \in F_n.$$

Hence

$$\left\| [u_p^n, \psi] \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{3|S_{n-1}|},\ \ \psi \in \Psi'_{n-1},\ \ p \in F_n.$$

By ($n.b$) and ($n-1.7$), we have

$$\left\| \varphi \cdot \left(u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^{n*} - c^{n-2}(p,q) \right) \right\| < \varepsilon_{n-1},$$
$$\left\| \left(u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^{n*} - c^{n-2}(p,q) \right) \cdot \varphi \right\| < \varepsilon_{n-1}$$

for $p \in F_{n-1}$, $q \in S_{n-1}$ and $\varphi \in \Phi_{n-1}$.

Since $\Phi_{n-1} \cdot c^{n-2}(p,q) \subset \Psi'_{n-1}$, $p \in F_{n-1}$, $q \in S_{n-1}$, and $F_{n-1}S_{n-1} \subset F_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \varphi \cdot (u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) u_{pq}^{n*} - 1) \right\| \\
&\quad = \left\| \varphi \cdot u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-1)}(u_q^n) - \varphi \cdot u_{pq}^n \right\| \\
&\quad \le \left\| [u_{pq}^n, \varphi] \right\| + \left\| \varphi \cdot u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) - u_{pq}^n \cdot \varphi \right\| \\
&\quad = \varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\| \varphi \cdot u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) - u_{pq}^n \cdot \varphi \cdot c^{n-2}(p,q) \right\| \\
&\quad \le \varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\| [u_{pq}^n, \varphi \cdot c^{n-2}(p,q)] \right\| + \left\| \varphi \cdot u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) - \varphi \cdot c^{n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^n \right\| \\
&\quad \le 2\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\| \varphi \cdot u_p^n \gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n) c^{n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^{n*} - \varphi \cdot c^{n-2}(p,q) \right\| \\
&\quad < 3\varepsilon_{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

for $\varphi \in \Phi_{n-1}$, $p \in F_{n-1}$ and $q \in S_{n-1}$.

Since $\left(\gamma_p^{(n-2)}\right)^{-1}(c^{n-2}(p',q)\cdot\varphi)\in\Psi'_{n-1}$ for $p,p'\in F_{n-1}$, $q\in S_{n-1}$ and $\varphi\in\Phi_{n-1}$,

$$\left\|[\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q), c^{n-2}(p',q')\cdot\varphi]\right\| = \left\|[u_q, \left(\gamma_p^{(n-2)}\right)^{-1}\left(c^{n-2}(p',q')\cdot\varphi\right)]\right\| < \varepsilon_{n-1}$$

for $p,p'\in F_{n-1}$, $q,q'\in S_{n-1}$ and $\varphi\in\Phi_{n-1}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|(u_p^n\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n)u_{pq}^{n*}-1)\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&= \left\|\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*}\cdot\varphi - u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|[\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*},\varphi]\right\| + \left\|\varphi\cdot\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*} - u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})[u_p^{n*},\varphi]\right\| + \left\|[\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*}),\varphi]u_p^{n*}\right\| + \left\|\varphi\cdot\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*} - u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\|\varphi\cdot\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*} - u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&= 2\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\|c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi\cdot\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*} - c^{n-2}(p,q)u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\|\left[\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*}, c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi\right]\right\| \\
&\quad + \left\|\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*}c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi - c^{n-2}(p,q)u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\|\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})\left[u_p^{n*}, c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi\right]\right\| + \left\|\left[\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*}), c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi\right]u_p^{n*}\right\| \\
&\quad + \left\|\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*}c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi - c^{n-2}(p,q)u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&\leq 4\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\|\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^{n*})u_p^{n*}c^{n-2}(p,q)\cdot\varphi - c^{n-2}(p,q)u_{pq}^{n*}\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&= 4\varepsilon_{n-1} + \left\|\left(u_p^n\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n)c^{n-2}(p,q)u_{pq}^{n*} - c^{n-2}(p,q)\right)\cdot\varphi\right\| \\
&< 5\varepsilon_{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

holds for $p\in F_{n-1}$, $q\in S_{n-1}$ and $\varphi\in\Phi_{n-1}$.

By Lemma 5.2, there exists a unitary w_n such that

$$\|(u_p^n\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(w_n)w_n^*-1)\cdot\varphi\| < 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n-1}},\ \|\varphi\cdot(u_p^n\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(w_n)w_n^*-1)\| < 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n-1}}$$

and $\|[w_n,\psi]\| < \varepsilon_{n-1}$ for $\varphi\in\Phi_{n-1}$, $p\in F_{n-1}$ and $\psi\in\Psi'_{n-1}$. Put $a_p^n = u_p^n\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(w_n)w_n^*$. We then obtain ($n$.8) and ($n$.9).

Set

$$b_p^n = a_p^n w_n b_p^{n-2} w_n^*,\ \theta_n = \operatorname{Ad} w_n\circ\theta_{n-2},\ c^n(p,q) = u_p^n\gamma_p^{(n-2)}(u_q^n)c^{n-2}(p,q)u_{pq}^{n*},$$

$$\gamma_p^{(n)} = \operatorname{Ad} u_p^n\circ\gamma_p^{(n-2)} = \operatorname{Ad} a_p^n\circ\operatorname{Ad} w_n\circ\gamma_p^{(n-2)}\circ\operatorname{Ad} w_n^*.$$

Then we obtain (n.3), (n.4) and (n.5). From ($n.a$) and ($n.b$), (n.6) and (n.7) follow. Thus the n-th step is complete, and we finished the induction.

We show $\{\theta_{2n}\}$ and $\{\theta_{2n+1}\}$ converge to some automorphisms. Fix $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$. Take $\psi\in\Psi_{n_0}$. If $n\geq n_0+1$, then $\psi,\theta_n(\psi)\in\Psi'_{n+1}$. By ($n+2$.9), we have

$$\|\theta_n(\psi)-\theta_{n+2}(\psi)\| = \|[w_{n+2},\theta_n(\psi)]\| < \varepsilon_{n+1},\ \|\theta_n^{-1}(\psi)-\theta_{n+2}^{-1}(\psi)\| = \|[w_{n+2},\psi]\| < \varepsilon_{n+1}.$$

Since $\bigcup_n\Psi_n$ is total in M_*, $\{\theta_{2n}^{\pm1}(\psi)\}$ and $\{\theta_{2n+1}^{\pm1}(\psi)\}$ are Cauchy sequences for all $\psi\in M_*$. Hence limits $\bar\theta_0 = \lim_n\theta_{2n}$ and $\bar\theta_1 = \lim_n\theta_{2n+1}$ exist in the u-topology.

Next we show the existence of $\lim_n b_p^{2n}$ and $\lim_n b_p^{2n+1}$. Fix $p \in F_{n_0+1}$. Note $\varphi_0 \in \Phi_m \subset \Psi'_m$ for all m, and $\varphi_0 \cdot b_p^n, b_p^n \cdot \varphi_0 \in \Psi'_{n+1}$, $\operatorname{Ad} b_p^n(\varphi_0) \in \Phi_{n+1}$ for $n \geq n_0$. By $(n+2.8)$ and $(n+2.9)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\varphi_0 \cdot (b_p^{n+2} - b_p^n)\right\| &= \|\varphi_0 \cdot (a_p^{n+2} w_{n+2} b_p^n w_{n+2}^* - b_p^n)\| \\
&= \|\varphi_0 \cdot (a_p^{n+2} - b_p^n w_{n+2} b_p^{n*} w_{n+2}^*)\| \\
&\leq \|\varphi_0 \cdot (a_p^{n+2} - 1)\| + \|\varphi_0 \cdot (1 - b_p^n w_{n+2} b_p^{n*} w_{n+2}^*)\| \\
&\leq 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n+1}} + \|\varphi_0 \cdot (w_{n+2} b_p^n - b_p^n w_{n+2})\| \\
&\leq 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n+1}} + \|\varphi_0 \cdot w_{n+2} b_p^n - w_{n+2} \cdot \varphi_0 \cdot b_p^n\| + \|[w_{n+2}, \varphi_0 \cdot b_p^n]\| \\
&\leq 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n+1}} + 2\varepsilon_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

We next estimate $\|(b_p^{n+2} - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\|$. By $(n+2.8)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(b_p^{n+2} - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| &= \|(a_p^{n+2} w_{n+2} b_p^n w_n^* - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| \\
&\leq \|a_p^{n+2}(w_{n+2} b_p^n w_{n+2}^* - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| + \|(a_p^{n+2} - 1) b_p^n \cdot \varphi_0\| \\
&< \|(w_{n+2} b_p^n w_{n+2}^* - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| + 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By $(n+2.9)$, the first term is estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(w_{n+2} b_p^n w_{n+2}^* - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| &= \|(b_p^n w_{n+2}^* - w_{n+2}^* b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| \\
&\leq \|b_p^n w_{n+2}^* \cdot \varphi_0 - b_p^n \cdot \varphi_0 \cdot w_{n+2}^*\| + \|[w_{n+2}^*, b_p^n \cdot \varphi_0]\| \\
&< 2\varepsilon_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain $\|(b_p^{n+2} - b_p^n) \cdot \varphi_0\| < 7\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon_{n+1}} + 2\varepsilon_{n+1}$. The above estimation yields that $\hat{u}_p^0 = \lim_n b_p^{2n}$ and $\hat{u}_p^1 = \lim_n b_p^{2n+1}$ exist in the σ-strong* topology.

We have $\gamma_p^{(2n)} = \operatorname{Ad} b_p^{2n} \circ \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_p \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1}$ and $\gamma_p^{(2n+1)} = \operatorname{Ad} b_p^{2n+1} \circ \theta_{2n+1} \circ \beta_p \circ \theta_{2n+1}^{-1}$ by construction. Letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain $\operatorname{Ad} \hat{u}_p^0 \circ \bar{\theta}_0 \circ \alpha_p \circ \bar{\theta}_0^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad} \hat{u}_p^1 \circ \bar{\theta}_1 \circ \beta_p \circ \bar{\theta}_1^{-1}$ by $(n.6)$.

We will show the convergence of $c^{2n}(p,q)$ and $c^{2n+1}(p,q)$. Put $\bar{w}_{2n} = w_{2n} w_{2n-2} \cdots w_2$. Of course $\theta_{2n} = \operatorname{Ad} \bar{w}_{2n}$. We can easily verify $u_p^{2n} u_p^{2n-2} \cdots u_p^2 = b_p^{2n} \bar{w}_{2n} \alpha_p(\bar{w}_{2n}^*)$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
c^{2n}(p,q) &= u_p^{2n} \gamma_p^{(2n-2)}(u_q^{2n}) c^{2n-2}(p,q) u_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= u_p^{2n} \gamma_p^{(2n-2)}(u_q^{2n}) u_p^{2n-2} \gamma_p^{(2n-4)}(u_q^{2n-2}) c^{2n-4}(p,q) u_{pq}^{2n-2*} u_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= u_p^{2n} u_p^{2n-2} \gamma_p^{(2n-4)}(u_q^{2n} u_q^{2n-2}) c^{2n-4}(p,q) u_{pq}^{2n-2*} u_{pq}^{2n*}.
\end{aligned}$$

We repeat the above computation and obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
c^{2n}(p,q) &= u_p^{2n} \cdots u_p^2 \alpha_p(u_q^{2n} \cdots u_q^2) c^\alpha(p,q) u_{pq}^{2*} \cdots u_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= b_p^{2n} \bar{w}_{2n} \alpha_p(\bar{w}_{2n}^*) \alpha_p(b_q^{2n} \bar{w}_{2n} \alpha_q(\bar{w}_{2n}^*)) c^\alpha(p,q) \alpha_{pq}(\bar{w}_{2n}) \bar{w}_{2n}^* b_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= b_p^{2n} \bar{w}_{2n} \alpha_p(\bar{w}_{2n}^* b_q^{2n} \bar{w}_{2n}) \alpha_p \alpha_q(\bar{w}_{2n}^*) c^\alpha(p,q) \alpha_{pq}(\bar{w}_{2n}) \bar{w}_{2n}^* b_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= b_p^{2n} \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_p \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1}(b_q^{2n}) \bar{w}_{2n} c^\alpha(p,q) \alpha_{pq} \circ \sigma_{m(p,q)}(\bar{w}_{2n}^*) \alpha_{pq}(\bar{w}_{2n}) \bar{w}_{2n}^* b_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= b_p^{2n} \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_p \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1}(b_q^{2n}) \theta_{2n}(c^\alpha(p,q)) \bar{w}_{2n} \alpha_{pq} \left(\sigma_{m(p,q)}(\bar{w}_{2n}^*) \bar{w}_{2n}\right) \bar{w}_{2n}^* b_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= b_p^{2n} \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_p \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1}(b_q^{2n}) \theta_{2n}(c^\alpha(p,q)) \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_{pq} \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1} \left(\bar{w}_{2n} \sigma_{m(p,q)}(\bar{w}_{2n}^*)\right) b_{pq}^{2n*} \\
&= b_p^{2n} \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_p \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1}(b_q^{2n}) \theta_{2n}(c^\alpha(p,q)) \theta_{2n} \circ \alpha_{pq} \circ \theta_{2n}^{-1}(\theta_{2n}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)}) \tilde{u}_{m(p,q)}^*) b_{pq}^{2n*}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the canonical extension is continuous in the u-topology, $\theta_{2n}(\tilde{u}_{m(p.q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)}$ converges to $\bar{\theta}_0(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)}$. Similar results holds for $c^{2n-1}(p,q)$. Then by $(n.7)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{u}^0_p\bar{\theta}_0\circ\alpha_p\circ\bar{\theta}_0^{-1}(\hat{u}^0_q)\bar{\theta}_0(c^\alpha(p,q))\bar{\theta}_0\circ\alpha_{pq}\circ\bar{\theta}_0^{-1}(\bar{\theta}_0(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)})\hat{u}^{0*}_{pq}\\ &\quad=\hat{u}^1_p\bar{\theta}_1\circ\beta_p\circ\bar{\theta}_1^{-1}(\hat{u}^1_q)\bar{\theta}_1\circ\beta_{pq}\circ\bar{\theta}_1^{-1}(\bar{\theta}_1(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\tilde{u}^*_{m(p,q)})\hat{u}^{1*}_{pq}\end{aligned}$$

and finished the proof of Theorem 6.1. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Set $\bar{\theta}_0(\tilde{u}_n)=\tilde{u}^\alpha_n$, $\bar{\theta}_1(\tilde{u}_n)=\tilde{u}^\beta_n$, $\hat{u}_{\tilde{p}}=\hat{u}^{1*}_p\hat{u}^0_p$, $p\in Q$, and $\hat{u}_n=\tilde{u}^\beta_n\tilde{u}^{\alpha*}_n$, $n\in H$.

We replace $(\alpha_g, v^\alpha(g,h))$ and $(\beta_g,1)$ with $(\bar{\theta}_0\circ\alpha_g\circ\bar{\theta}_0^{-1},\bar{\theta}_0(v^\alpha(g,h)))$ and $(\bar{\theta}_1\circ\beta_g\circ\bar{\theta}_1^{-1},1)$ respectively. Note that we do not have $\alpha_n=\beta_n$, $n\in H$, after this replacement, and in fact we have $\beta_n=\operatorname{Ad}\hat{u}_n\circ\alpha_n$, $\tilde{\alpha}_n=\operatorname{Ad}\tilde{u}^\alpha_n$ and $\tilde{\beta}_n=\operatorname{Ad}\tilde{u}^\beta_n$.

Summarizing results in Theorem 6.1, we have the following.

$$\beta_{\tilde{p}}=\operatorname{Ad}\hat{u}_{\tilde{p}}\circ\alpha_{\tilde{p}},\ \ \hat{u}_{\tilde{p}}\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(\hat{u}_{\tilde{q}})c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\hat{u}^*_{m(p,q)})\hat{u}^*_{\widetilde{pq}}=1,\ \ p,q\in Q.$$

For $r\in Q$ and $n\in H$, we define $\hat{u}_{n\tilde{r}}=\hat{u}_n\alpha_n(\hat{u}_{\tilde{r}})v^\alpha(n,\tilde{r})$. Then $\beta_g=\operatorname{Ad}\hat{u}_g\circ\alpha_g$ holds for every $g\in G$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}_n\alpha_n(\hat{u}_{\tilde{r}})\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},n)^*\alpha_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{u}^*_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}})\hat{u}^*_{\tilde{r}} &= \hat{u}_n\tilde{u}^\alpha_n\hat{u}_{\tilde{r}}\tilde{u}^{\alpha*}_n\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},n)^*\alpha_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{u}^*_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}})\hat{u}^*_{\tilde{r}}\\ &= \hat{u}_n\tilde{u}^\alpha_n\tilde{\beta}_{\tilde{r}}\tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{r}}^{-1}\left(\tilde{u}^{\alpha*}_n\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},n)^*\alpha_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{u}^*_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}})\right)\\ &= \lambda(\tilde{r},n)\hat{u}_n\tilde{u}^\alpha_n\tilde{\beta}_{\tilde{r}}\left(\tilde{u}^{\alpha*}_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}}\hat{u}^*_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}}\right)\\ &= \lambda(\tilde{r},n)\tilde{u}^\beta_n\tilde{\beta}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{u}^{\beta*}_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}})\\ &= 1,\end{aligned}$$

we have $\hat{u}_n\alpha_n(\hat{u}_{\tilde{r}})v^\alpha(n,\tilde{r})=\hat{u}_{\tilde{r}}\alpha_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{u}_{\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r}})v^\alpha(\tilde{r},\tilde{r}^{-1}n\tilde{r})$. Compare this result with Lemma 4.1. Then in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.7, we can show $\hat{u}_g\alpha_g(\hat{u}_h)v^\alpha(g,h)\hat{u}^*_{gh}=1$ for $g,h\in G$. Thus α and β are strongly cocycle conjugate. $\square$

7 Model actions

Construction of model actions with given invariant is presented in [38], [19] by using groupoid theory. However essential point of use of groupoid theory is to construct a right inverse for the Connes-Takesaki module map. Thus it may be possible to construct model actions without groupoid theory once one admits the existence of the right inverse of the module map [40]. In this section, we present the construction of model actions along this observation.

Let φ be a dominant weight, and $M=M_\varphi\rtimes_\theta\mathbb{R}$ be a continuous decomposition, and $u(s)$ the implementing unitary for θ_t. Let G a discrete amenable group, and α an action of G on M. We quickly review how to describe $\operatorname{Inv}(\alpha)$ in terms of M_φ.

We may assume that $\varphi\circ\alpha=\varphi$, and $\alpha_g(u(s))=u(s)$ by cocycle perturbation [39]. In this case, M_φ is invariant under α_g, and we denote by α'_g the restriction on M_φ. Then $\operatorname{Inv}(\alpha)$ is obtained as follows. A Connes-Takesaki module is given by $\operatorname{mod}(\alpha_g)=\alpha'_g|_{Z(M_\varphi)}$. Let $H:=\{g\in G\mid \alpha'_g\in\operatorname{Int}(M_\varphi)\}$, which is a centrally trivial part of α. Fix $v_n\in U(M_\varphi)$

with $\alpha'_n = \operatorname{Ad} v_n$. Then we get a characteristic cocycle $(\lambda, \mu) \in Z(G, H, U(Z(M_\varphi)))$ and $c_t(n) \in Z^1(\mathbb{R}, U(Z(M_\varphi)))$ as follows.

$$\alpha'_g(v_{g^{-1}ng}) = \lambda(g,n)v_n,\ v_m v_n = \mu(m,n)v_{mn},\ \theta_t(v_n) = c_t(n)v_n.$$

In this case, $\alpha_n = \operatorname{Ad} v_n \circ \sigma^\varphi_{c(n)}$ holds, where $\sigma^\varphi_{c(n)}$ is an extended modular automorphism [8].

Conversely, for a normal subgroup $H \subset G$, a homomorphism $\beta : g \in G \to \beta_g \in \operatorname{Aut}_\theta(Z(M_\varphi))$, (λ, μ), and $c_t(n)$, we will construct a model action γ_g with $\operatorname{Inv}(\gamma) = (H, \beta_g, [\lambda, \mu, c])$.

By [40, Corollary 1.3], the exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \overline{\operatorname{Int}}(M) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Aut}(M) \overset{\text{mod}}{\longrightarrow} \operatorname{Aut}_\theta(Z(M_\varphi)) \to 1$$

is split. By regarding β as a faithful homomorphism from $G/\operatorname{Ker}(\beta)$ into $\operatorname{Aut}_\theta(Z(M_\varphi))$, we lift β as an action of G on M by the above splitting exact sequence. We may assume $\varphi \circ \beta_g = \varphi$, $\beta_g(u(s)) = u(s)$.

Let $\partial(u)_t := u\theta_t(u^*) \in Z^1(\mathbb{R}, U(Z(M_\varphi)))$ for $u \in U(Z(M_\varphi))$. Since

$$c_t(m)c_t(n) = c_t(mn)\partial(\mu(m,n)^*)_t,\ \beta_g(c_t(g^{-1}ng)) = \partial(\lambda(g,n)^*)_t c_t(n),$$

we have

$$\sigma^\varphi_{c(m)^*} \circ \sigma^\varphi_{c(n)^*} = \sigma^\varphi_{c(m)^*c(n)^*} = \sigma^\varphi_{\partial(\mu)c(mn)^*} = \operatorname{Ad}\mu(m,n) \circ \sigma^\varphi_{c(mn)^*},$$

and

$$\beta_g \circ \sigma^\varphi_{c(g^{-1}ng)^*} \circ \beta_g^{-1} = \sigma^\varphi_{\beta_g(c(g^{-1}ng)^*)} = \sigma^\varphi_{\partial(\lambda(g,n))c(n)^*} = \operatorname{Ad}\lambda(g,n) \circ \sigma^\varphi_{c(n)^*}.$$

In particular, $(\sigma^\varphi_{c(n)^*}, \mu(m,n))$ is a cocycle crossed action of H.

Let R_0 be the injective factor of type II$_1$ with a tracial state τ, and $\alpha^{(0)}_g$ a free action of G on R_0. Let $\alpha_m := \sigma^\varphi_{c(m)^*} \otimes \alpha^{(0)}_m$, and take a twisted crossed product $N = (M \otimes R_0) \rtimes_{\alpha, \mu\otimes 1} H$. Let v_n be the implementing unitary for α. Since $\operatorname{Inv}(\alpha)$ is trivial, N and M have a common flow of weights by [23], [36]. Hence $N \cong M$ by the classification theorem of injective factors. Let $\psi := (\varphi \otimes \tau) \circ E$, where E is the canonical conditional expectation on M. Then ψ is dominant, and $N_\psi = (M_\varphi \otimes R_0) \otimes_{\alpha, \mu\otimes 1} H$.

Let $\gamma_g = \beta_g \otimes \alpha^{(0)}_g$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma_g \circ \alpha_{g^{-1}ng} \circ \gamma_g^{-1} = \operatorname{Ad}(\lambda(g,n) \otimes 1) \circ \alpha_n,\\
&\lambda(g,m)\lambda(g,n)\mu(m,n)\lambda(g,mn)^* = \beta_g(\mu(g^{-1}mg, g^{-1}ng)),\\
&\lambda(gh,n) = \beta_g(\lambda(h, g^{-1}ng))\lambda(g,n),
\end{aligned}$$

we can extend γ_g to an action on N by $\gamma_g(v_{g^{-1}ng}) = (\lambda(g,n) \otimes 1)v_n$. (See Appendix B on the existence of such extension.)

By the definition of γ_g, it is trivial that $\operatorname{mod}(\gamma_g) = \beta_g$. If $m \in H$, then $\gamma'_m = \gamma_m|_{N_\psi}$ is given by $\operatorname{Ad} v_m$. Indeed if $x \in M_\varphi \otimes R_0$, then

$$\gamma'_m(x) = \operatorname{id} \otimes \alpha^0_m(x) = \sigma^\varphi_{c(m)^*} \otimes \alpha^{(0)}_m(x) = \operatorname{Ad} v_m(x).$$

Note $\beta_m = \operatorname{id}$ and $\sigma^\varphi_{c(m)^*}|_{M_\varphi} = \operatorname{id}$ for $m \in H$. By $\lambda(m,n) = \mu(m, m^{-1}nm)\mu(n,m)^*$, $m, n \in H$, we have

$$\gamma'_m(v_{m^{-1}nm}) = \lambda(m,n)v_n = \mu(m, m^{-1}nm)\mu(n,m)^* v_n = v_m v_{m^{-1}nm} v_m^*.$$

Due to the freeness of $\alpha_g^{(0)}$, $\gamma'_g \in \mathrm{Int}(N_\psi)$ if and only if $g \in H$. By the definition of N and γ_g, we have $\gamma_g(v_{g^{-1}ng}) = \lambda(g,n)v_n$ and $v_m v_n = \mu(m,n)v_{mn}$. We can verify $\theta_t \otimes \mathrm{id}(v_n) = (c_t(n) \otimes 1)v_n$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_t \otimes \mathrm{id}(v_n) &= (u(t)\otimes 1)v_n(u(t)\otimes 1)^* = (u(t)\otimes 1)\alpha_n(u(-t)\otimes 1)v_n \\ &= (u(t)\sigma^{\varphi}_{c(n)^*}(u(-t))\otimes 1)v_n = (u(t)c_{-t}(n)^* u(t)\otimes 1)v_n \\ &= (\theta_t(c_{-t}(n)^*)\otimes 1)v_n = (c_t(n)\otimes 1)v_n.\end{aligned}$$

The above argument shows that γ_g realizes the given invariant.

Here we treat only type III factors, however this construction is valid for the type II case. If we use results in [10], we can generalize the above construction for arbitrary faithful normal semifinite weights.

8 Group actions on subfactors

In this section, we see that we can apply our previous argument for group actions on subfactors. We briefly recall basic notations for group actions of subfactors

Let $N \subset M$ be a strongly amenable subfactor of type II_1 in the sense of [33], and $N \subset M \subset M_1 \subset M_2 \subset \cdots$ the Jones tower. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(M,N)$, $\Phi(\alpha) = \{\alpha|_{M'\cap M_k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ denotes the Loi invariant [25]. Let $\mathrm{Cnt}_r(M,N)$ be a set of all non-strongly outer automorphisms [1], and $\chi_a(M,N) = (\mathrm{Ker}(\Phi)\cap \mathrm{Cnt}_r(M,N))\,/\mathrm{Int}(M,N)$ the algebraic χ-group [11]. Since $N \subset M$ is strongly amenable, $\mathrm{Ker}(\Phi) = \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M,N)$ and $\mathrm{Cnt}(M,N) = \mathrm{Cnt}_r(M,N)$ hold. (See [25], [27], [34].) Take $\alpha \in \mathrm{Ker}(\Phi)$ and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Cnt}_r(M,N)$. Let $0 \neq a \in M_k$ be an element such that $\sigma(x)a = ax$ holds for all $x \in M$. Then there exists a unitary $u(\alpha,\sigma) \in N$ such that $\alpha(a) = u(\alpha,\sigma)a$ [28], which does not depend on a. This $u(\alpha,\sigma)$ satisfies $\alpha\circ\sigma\circ\alpha^{-1} = \mathrm{Ad}\,u(\alpha,\sigma)\circ\sigma$. See [28] for more properties of $u(\alpha,\sigma)$.

We assume the following.
(1) The normalizer groups for $N \subset M$ and $M \subset M_1$ are trivial.
(2) There exists a lifting $\sigma : \chi_a(M,N) \to \mathrm{Aut}(M,N)$.
Typical examples of such subfactors are the Jones subfactors with principal graph A_{2k+1}, $k \geq 2$, [17].

Let $(\alpha, v^\alpha(g,h))$ be a cocycle crossed action of G on $N \subset M$ with trivial Loi invariant. (This condition corresponds to the triviality of Connes-Takesaki modules in the previous sections.) Let $H = \{h \in G \mid \alpha_g \in \mathrm{Cnt}(M,N)\}$. The ν-invariant $\nu(n)$ is given by $\nu(n) = [\alpha_n] \in \chi_a(M,N)$. Note that $\nu(gng^{-1}) = \nu(n)$ holds by $\Phi(\alpha_g) = \mathrm{id}$. Fix $u_n^\alpha \in N$ with $\alpha_n = \mathrm{Ad}\,u_n^\alpha\circ\sigma_{\nu(n)}$. Then the characteristic invariant $[\lambda,\mu]$ for α is given as follows.

$$\alpha_g(u^\alpha_{g^{-1}ng})u(\alpha_g,\sigma_{\nu(h)}) = \lambda(g,n)\delta v^\alpha(g,n)u^\alpha_n,\ \ u^\alpha_m\sigma_{\nu(m)}(u^\alpha_n) = \mu(m,n)v^\alpha(m,n)u^\alpha_{mn}.$$

We remark that $[\lambda,\mu]$ may be different from usual characteristic invariant. Let $\kappa(k,l) := u(\sigma_l,\sigma_k)^*$ be the κ-invariant for $N \subset M$. (This notion comes from [15].) The only difference is the following relation.

$$\lambda(m,n) = \mu(m,m^{-1}nm)\overline{\mu(n,m)\kappa(\nu(n),\nu(m))},\ m,n \in H.$$

In [28] and [26], we show $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha) = (H,[\lambda,\mu],\nu)$ is a complete cocycle conjugacy invariant for approximately inner actions of discrete amenable groups on subfactors with conditions (1) and (2) under some restrictions, e.g, the triviality of the κ-invariant. However if we modify the argument in the previous sections in a suitable way, we can get rid of these restrictions.

Let $(\beta, v^\beta(m,n))$ be another cocycle crossed action of G with $\mathrm{Inv}(\beta) = \mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)$. We choose u_m^β which satisfies the same relation for (λ, μ). If we put $w_n := u_m^a u_m^{\beta *}$ for $m \in H$, then $\alpha_n = \mathrm{Ad}\, w_n \beta_n$ and $w_m \alpha_m(w_n) v^\alpha(m,n) w_{mn}^* = v^\beta(m,n)$ holds. Hence the same conclusion in Lemma 3.1 holds. As in the single factor case, we may assume that $\alpha_n = \beta_n$ is a genuine action of H.

If $0 \neq a \in M_k$ satisfies $\sigma_{\nu(n)}(x)a = ax$ for all $x \in M$, then $a_n := u_n^\alpha a$ satisfies $\alpha_n(x)a_n = a_n x$. Moreover, by the definition of $\lambda(g,n)$ and $\alpha_g(a) = u(\alpha_g, \sigma_{\nu(n)})a$, we have $\alpha_g(a_{g^{-1}ng}) = \lambda(g,n)\delta v^\alpha(g,n)a_n$. By using these facts, we can show a similar result in Lemma 4.1 as follows.

Lemma 8.1 *For any $U_g = (v_g^\nu) \in U(N^\omega)$ with $\lim_{\nu\to\omega} \alpha_g = \mathrm{Ad}\, v_g^\nu \circ \beta_g$. Then we have $U_g^* \delta v^\alpha(g,n) \sigma_n(U_g) = \delta v^\beta(g,n)$.*

Proof. Let $0 \neq a_n \in M_k$ as above. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\nu\to\omega} u_g^{\nu *}\delta v^\alpha(g,h)\alpha_n(u_g^\nu)a_n &= \lim_{\nu\to\omega} u_g^{\nu *}\delta v^\alpha(g,h)a_n u_g^\nu = \beta_g\alpha_g^{-1}(\delta v^\alpha(g,h)a_n)\\ &= \lambda(g,n)^*\beta_g(a_{g^{-1}ng}) = \delta v^\beta(g,n)a_n\end{aligned}$$

holds.

Let E be the minimal conditional expectation from M_k to M. Since $0 \neq a_n a_n^* \in M' \cap M_k$, $0 \neq E(a_n a_n^*) \in \mathbb{C}$ follows, and hence we get the conclusion. □

Thus we can repeat the same argument in the previous sections, and classify approximately inner actions of discrete amenable groups on $N \subset M$. In particular, the higher obstruction introduced in [21] and the ν-invariant are complete outer conjugacy invariants for automorphisms on Jones subfactors with principal graph A_{2k+1}, $k \geq 2$. Note all automorphisms of Jones subfactors with principal graph A_n, $n \geq 4$, are approximately inner.

We close this section by explaining the construction of model actions.

Let $N \subset M$ be as above, and R_0 the injective factor of type II_1. Let $\alpha_g^{(0)}$ be a free action of G on R_0. Let $\alpha_n := \sigma_{\nu(n)^{-1}} \otimes \alpha_n^{(0)}$, and $\tilde{\mu}(m,n) := \mu(m,n)\kappa(\nu(m),\nu(n))$. Take a twisted crossed product $A \subset B := (N \otimes R_0 \subset M \otimes R_0) \rtimes_{\alpha,\tilde{\mu}} H$. Since $\mathrm{Inv}(\alpha)$ is trivial, the standard invariant of $A \subset B$ and that of $N \subset M$ are coincide, thus they are isomorphic by Popa's classification theorem [33]. Let v_n be the implementing unitary, and define $\gamma_g \in \mathrm{Aut}(B,A)$ as follows.

$$\gamma_g(x) = \mathrm{id} \otimes \alpha_g^{(0)}(x),\ x \in M \otimes R_0,\ \gamma_g(v_{g^{-1}ng}) = \lambda(g,n)v_n.$$

We extend $\sigma_k \otimes \mathrm{id}$ to $\tilde{\sigma}_k \in \mathrm{Aut}(B,A)$ by $\tilde{\sigma}_k(v_n) = \overline{\kappa(k,\nu(n))}v_n$. We claim that $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ is non-strongly outer. Take $0 \neq a \in M_k$ such that $\sigma_k(x)a = ax$, $x \in M$. It is clear $\tilde{\sigma}_k(x)(a \otimes 1) = (a \otimes 1)x$ for $x \in M_k \otimes R_0$. By the definition of the κ-invariant,

$$\tilde{\sigma}_k(v_n)(a \otimes 1) = \overline{\kappa(k,\nu(n))}v_n(a \otimes 1) = (u(\sigma_{\nu(n)},k)\sigma_{\nu(n)^{-1}}(a) \otimes 1)v_n = (a \otimes 1)v_n.$$

Thus $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ is non-strongly outer.

We next show $\mathrm{Ad}\, v_n \tilde{\sigma}_n = \gamma_n$, $n \in H$. For $x \in M \otimes R_0$,

$$\mathrm{Ad}\, v_n \circ \tilde{\sigma}_{\nu(n)} = \mathrm{Ad}\, v_n \circ \sigma_{\nu(n)} \otimes \mathrm{id}(x) = \mathrm{id} \otimes \alpha_n^0(x) = \gamma_n(x).$$

If we use $\lambda(m,n) = \mu(m, m^{-1}nm)\overline{\mu(n,m)\kappa(\nu(n),\nu(m))}$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{Ad}\, v_m \circ \tilde{\sigma}_{\nu(m)}(v_{m^{-1}nm}) & = & \overline{\kappa(\nu(m),\mu(n))} v_m v_{m^{-1}nm} v_m^* \\ & = & \overline{\kappa(\nu(m),\mu(m^{-1}nm))}\tilde{\mu}(m, m^{-1}nm)\overline{\tilde{\mu}(n,m)} v_n \\ & = & \mu(m, m^{-1}nm)\overline{\mu(n,m)\kappa(\nu(n),\nu(m))} v_n = \lambda(m,n) v_n, \end{array}$$

and hence we have $\mathrm{Ad}\, v_n \tilde{\sigma}_{\nu(n)} = \gamma_n$. We can easily see that γ_g is strongly outer for $g \in G \backslash H$. Since $\gamma_g(a \otimes 1) = a \otimes 1$, $u(\gamma_g, \tilde{\sigma}_k) = 1$. By the definition of γ, it is trivial that $[\lambda, \mu]$ is a characteristic invariant for γ.

9 G-kernels, or outer actions.

Let M be an injective factor, and G a discrete amenable group. Let α be an injective homomorphism from G to $\mathrm{Out}(M)$, or equivalently α be a map from G to $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ such that $\alpha_g \circ \alpha_h \equiv \alpha_{gh} \mod (\mathrm{Int}(M))$, and $\alpha_g \notin \mathrm{Int}(M)$, $g \neq e$. Such α is called a G-kernel, or a free outer action in [20]. In this section, we briefly explain that the intertwining argument is applicable for classification of outer actions. (We always assume freeness.) Difference of our argument with that of [20] is that we do not have to use a resolution group, which depends on the choice of a representative 3-cocycle [20, Remark 2.15].

We first recall invariants for outer actions introduced in [20]. Let

$$H_\alpha = \{g \in G \mid \alpha_g \in \mathrm{Cnt}_r(M)\}.$$

As in the usual group action case, we get $c_t(n) \in Z^1(\mathbb{R}, Z(U(\tilde{M})))$, $n \in H_\alpha$, by $\theta_t(\tilde{u}_n) = c_t(n)\tilde{u}_n$. Thus we get $\nu(n) = [c_t(n)] \in H^1(\mathbb{R}, Z(U(\tilde{M})))$. Set $Q = G/H_\alpha$ and fix a section $\tilde{p} \in G$ for $p \in Q$. Fix $w^\alpha(p,q) \in U(\tilde{M})$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{p}}\tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{q}} = \mathrm{Ad}\, w^\alpha(p,q) \circ \tilde{\alpha}_{\widetilde{pq}}$, $w(e,q) = w(p,e) = 1$. Then we get $d_1^\alpha(p,q,r), d_2^\alpha(s;q,r) \in Z(U(\tilde{M}))$ by

$$w^\alpha(p,q) w^\alpha(pq,r) = d_1^\alpha(p,q,r)\tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{p}}(w^\alpha(q,r)) w^\alpha(p,qr),\ \theta_s(w^\alpha(q,r)) = d_2^\alpha(s;q,r) w^\alpha(q,r).$$

The modular obstruction $\mathrm{Ob_m}(\alpha)$ is defined as $([d_1^\alpha(p,q,r)\tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{p}}(d_2^\alpha(s;q,r)^*)], \nu)$.

Theorem 9.1 *Let M and G be as above. Let α and β be outer actions of G on M. If $(H_\alpha, \mathrm{mod}(\alpha), \mathrm{Ob_m}(\alpha)) = (H_\beta, \mathrm{mod}(\beta), \mathrm{Ob_m}(\beta))$, then $\alpha_g \equiv \sigma \circ \beta_g \circ \sigma^{-1} \mod \mathrm{Int}(M)$ for some $\sigma \in \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M)$.*

In the rest of this section, we assume $(H_\alpha, \mathrm{mod}(\alpha), \mathrm{Ob_m}(\alpha)) = (H_\beta, \mathrm{mod}(\beta), \mathrm{Ob_m}(\beta))$. Hence we can assume $\alpha_n = \beta_n$ for $n \in H = H_\alpha$ as in §3. We fix $\tilde{u}_n \in U(\tilde{M})$ with $\tilde{\alpha}_n = \mathrm{Ad}\, \tilde{u}_n$.

We take $v^\alpha(g,h) \in U(M)$ such that $\alpha_g \circ \alpha_h = \mathrm{Ad}\, v^\alpha(g,h) \circ \alpha_{gh}$. Then we get $[\gamma^\alpha] \in H^3(G, \mathbb{T})$ by

$$v^\alpha(g,h) v^\alpha(gh,k) = \gamma^\alpha(g,h,k)\alpha_g(v^\alpha(h,k)) v^\alpha(g,hk).$$

By [20, Lemma 2.11], $[\gamma^\alpha]$ is uniquely determined by $\mathrm{Ob}_{\mathrm{m}}(\alpha)$. As in the previous sections, set

$$c^\alpha(p,q)=v^\alpha(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})v^\alpha\left(\widetilde{pq},m(p,q)\right)^*,\ \delta v^\alpha(g,n)=v^\alpha(g,g^{-1}ng)v^\alpha(n,g)^*.$$

Once we fix $v^\alpha(g,h)$ and $\gamma^\alpha(g,h,k)$, we get $\lambda^\alpha(g,n),\mu^\alpha(m,n),c^\alpha_t(n)\in U(Z(\tilde{M}))$ as in §2, that is, they are defined as follows.

$$\alpha_g(\tilde{u}_{g^{-1}ng})=\lambda(g,n)\delta v^\alpha(g,n)\tilde{u}_n,\ \tilde{u}_m\tilde{u}_n=\mu^\alpha(m,n)v^\alpha(m,m)\tilde{u}_{mn},\ \theta_t(\tilde{u}_n)=c_t(n)\tilde{u}_n.$$

These unitaries enjoy the following relations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^\alpha(g,n)^*\theta_t(\lambda^\alpha(g,n)) &= c^\alpha_t(n)^*\tilde{\alpha}_g(c^\alpha_t(g^{-1}ng)),\\
c^\alpha_t(m)c^\alpha_t(n)c^\alpha_t(mn)^* &= \mu^\alpha(m,n)^*\theta_t(\mu^\alpha(m,n)),\\
\gamma^\alpha(l,m,n)\mu^\alpha(l,m)\mu^\alpha(lm,n) &= \mu^\alpha(m,n)\mu^\alpha(l,mn),\\
\lambda^\alpha(gh,n) &= \tilde{\alpha}_g(\lambda^\alpha(h,g^{-1}ng))\lambda^\alpha(g,n)\\
&\quad\times\gamma^\alpha(g,g^{-1}ng,h)\overline{\gamma^\alpha(n,g,h)\gamma^\alpha(g,h,h^{-1}g^{-1}ngh)},\\
\lambda^\alpha(g,mn)\lambda^\alpha(g,m)^*\lambda^\alpha(g,n)^* &= \mu^\alpha(m,n)\alpha_g(\mu^\alpha(g^{-1}mg,g^{-1}ng)^*)\\
&\quad\times\overline{\gamma^\alpha(m,g,g^{-1}ng)}\gamma^\alpha(g,g^{-1}mg,g^{-1}ng)\gamma^\alpha(m,n,g),\\
\lambda^\alpha(m,n) &= \mu^\alpha(m,m^{-1}nm)\mu^\alpha(n,m)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $Z(G,H;\gamma^\alpha,c^\alpha_t)$ be a set of all (λ,μ) satisfying the above relation for fixed γ^α and c^α_t. Here we can see that for $(\lambda,\mu),(\lambda',\mu')\in Z(G,H;\gamma^\alpha,c^\alpha_t)$, $(\lambda(\lambda')^*,\mu(\mu')^*)$ is a usual $\mathbb{T}$-valued characteristic cocycle.

We first clarify the relation between $(\lambda^\alpha,\nu^\alpha)$ and $\mathrm{Ob}_{\mathrm{m}}(\alpha)$.

Lemma 9.2 *For $p,q,r\in Q$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},m(p,q))^*)c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(pq,r),\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}))\\
&=\hat{\gamma}^\alpha(p,q,r)\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(p,qr),m(q,r))).
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\hat{\gamma}^\alpha(p,q,r)\in\mathbb{T}$.

Proof. Compute $(\alpha_{\tilde{p}}\circ\alpha_{\tilde{q}})\circ\alpha_{\tilde{r}}=\alpha_{\tilde{p}}\circ(\alpha_{\tilde{q}}\circ\alpha_{\tilde{r}})$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Ad}\left(c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r},m(p,q))^*)c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(pq,r),\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}))\right)\circ\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\circ\sigma_{m(p,q,r)}\\
&\quad=(\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(c^\alpha(q,r))c^\alpha(p,qr))\circ\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(p,qr),m(q,r)))\circ\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\circ\sigma_{m(p,q,r)}
\end{aligned}$$

and obtain the desired conclusion. □

Remark. $\hat{\gamma}^\alpha$ depends only on γ^α. To see this, let $(\beta,v^\beta(g,h))$ be another outer action of G with $\gamma^\alpha=\gamma^\beta$. Let $j(x)=x^*$ be a conjugate linear isomorphism from M to M^{opp}. Define $\theta_g:=\alpha\otimes j\circ\beta_g\circ j^{-1}$, $v^\theta(g,h)=v^\alpha(g,h)\otimes j(v^\beta(g,h))$. Then $(\theta_g,v^\theta(g,h))$ is a cocycle crossed action of G on $M\otimes M^{\mathrm{opp}}$ due to the conjugate linearity of $j(x)$. By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&c^\theta(p,q)\theta_{\widetilde{pq}}(\delta v^\theta(\tilde{r},m(p,q))^*)c^\theta(pq,r)\theta_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\theta(m(pq,r),\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}))\\
&=\theta_{\tilde{p}}(c^\theta(q,r))c^\theta(p,qr)\theta_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\theta(m(p,qr),m(q,r))).
\end{aligned}$$

Again by the conjugate linearity of $j(x)$, we get $\hat{\gamma}^\alpha(p,q,r)=\hat{\gamma}^\beta(p,q,r)$.

We can also describe $\hat{\gamma}^\alpha$ concretely. With a bit of little effort, we can show that $\hat{\gamma}^\alpha(p,q,r)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\gamma}^\alpha(p,q,r) &= \overline{\gamma^\alpha(\tilde{p}, \widetilde{qr}, m(q,r))\gamma^\alpha(\widetilde{pq}, m(p,q), \tilde{r})\gamma^\alpha(\widetilde{pqr}, m(pq,r), \tilde{r}^{-1}m(q,r)\tilde{r})} \\ &\quad \times\gamma^\alpha(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, \tilde{r})\gamma^\alpha(\widetilde{pq}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r})\gamma^\alpha(\widetilde{pqr}, m(p,qr), m(q,r)).\end{aligned}$$

We can also show $\hat{\gamma}^\alpha = \hat{\gamma}^\beta$ by the above formula. However we never use it in the rest of this paper. So we omit the proof of the above formula.

We fix $w^\alpha(p,q)$ as $w^\alpha(p,q) = c^\alpha(p,q)\tilde{\alpha}_{\widetilde{pq}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})$.

Lemma 9.3 *For $(\lambda^\alpha, \mu^\alpha) \in Z(G,H;\gamma^\alpha, c_t^\alpha)$ and $p,q,r \in Q$, define*

$$\delta_{\lambda,\mu}(p,q,r) = \alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\left(\lambda^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\right)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\left(\mu^\alpha(m(pq,r), \tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r})\mu^\alpha(m(p,qr), m(q,r))^*\right).$$

Then $d_1^\alpha(p,q,r) = \hat{\gamma}^\alpha(p,q,r)\delta_{\lambda^\alpha,\mu^\alpha}(p,q,r)$ holds.

Proof. We compute $w^\alpha(p,q)w^\alpha(pq,r)$ and $\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(w^\alpha(q,r))w^\alpha(p,qr)$. On one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&w^\alpha(p,q)w^\alpha(pq,r) \\
&= c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}) \\
&= c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}\alpha_{\tilde{r}}\alpha_{\tilde{r}}^{-1}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}) \\
&= c^\alpha(p,q)c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\sigma_{m(pq,r)}\alpha_{\tilde{r}}^{-1}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}) \\
&= c^\alpha(p,q)c_{pq,r}^\alpha\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\left(\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}\alpha_{\tilde{r}}^{-1}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})\right) \\
&= c^\alpha(p,q)c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\left(\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}\alpha_{\tilde{r}}^{-1}(\lambda^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)\tilde{u}_{\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}}\right) \\
&= \alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\lambda^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)c^\alpha(p,q)c^\alpha(pq,r) \\
&\quad \times\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\left(\sigma_{m(pq,r)}\left(\alpha_{\tilde{r}}^{-1}(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)\right)\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}\tilde{u}_{\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}}\right) \\
&= \alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\lambda^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\left(\tilde{u}_{m(pq,r)}\tilde{u}_{\tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r}}\right) \\
&= \alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\lambda^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\mu^\alpha(m(pq,r), \tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r})) \\
&\quad \times c^\alpha(p,q)\alpha_{\widetilde{pq}}(\delta v^\alpha(\tilde{r}, m(p,q))^*)c^\alpha(pq,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\left(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q,r)}v^\alpha(m(pq,r), \tilde{r}^{-1}m(p,q)\tilde{r})\right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(w^\alpha(q,r))w^\alpha(p,qr) &= \alpha_{\tilde{p}}\left(c^\alpha(q,r)\alpha_{\widetilde{qr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(q,r)})\right)c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,qr)}) \\
&= \alpha_{\tilde{p}}\left(c^\alpha(q,r)\right)\alpha_{\tilde{p}}\alpha_{\widetilde{qr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(q,r)})c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,qr)}) \\
&= \alpha_{\tilde{p}}\left(c^\alpha(q,r)\right)c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}\sigma_{m(p,qr)}(\tilde{u}_{m(q,r)})\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,qr)}) \\
&= \alpha_{\tilde{p}}\left(c^\alpha(q,r)\right)c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,qr)}\tilde{u}_{m(q,r)}) \\
&= \alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(\mu^\alpha(m(p,qr)m(q,r))) \\
&\quad \times\alpha_{\tilde{p}}\left(c^\alpha(q,r)\right)c^\alpha(p,qr)\alpha_{\widetilde{pqr}}(v^\alpha(m(p,qr), m(q,r))\tilde{u}_{m(p,q,r)}).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 9.2, we get the conclusion. □

The map $\delta_{\lambda,\mu}$ is the generalization of the Huebschmann-Jones-Ratcliffe map. The following is a part of the Huebschmann-Jones-Ratcliffe exact sequence [14, Theorem 2], [16, Proposition 4.2.5], [35, Theorem 8.1].

Lemma 9.4 *Let* $[\lambda,\mu]\in\Lambda(G,H,\mathbb{T})$ *be a usual* $\mathbb{T}$*-valued characteristic invariant. Then* $\delta_{\lambda,\mu}=1$ *in* $H^3(Q,\mathbb{T})$ *if and only if* $\lambda(g,n)=\xi(g,g^{-1}ng)\overline{\xi(n,g)}$ *and* $\mu(m,n)=\xi(m,n)$ *for some 2-cocycle* $\xi(g,h)\in Z^2(G,\mathbb{T})$.

Lemma 9.5 *Let* α *and* β *be as in Theorem 9.1. Then we can choose* $(\gamma^\alpha,\lambda^\alpha,\mu^\alpha,c_t^\alpha)=(\gamma^\beta,\lambda^\beta,\mu^\beta,c_t^\beta)$ *and* $v^\alpha(m,n)=v^\beta(m,n)$*,* $m,n\in H$.

Proof. Set $\partial(z)(p,q,r)=\alpha_{\tilde{p}}(z(q,r))z(p,qr)z(pq,r)^*z(p,q)^*$ for $z(p,q)\in U(Z(\tilde{M}))$. Let $w^\beta(p,q)=c^\beta(p,q)\beta_{\widetilde{pq}}(\tilde{u}_{m(p,q)})$. Since we have fixed $\tilde{u}_n\in U(\tilde{M})$ in such a way $\tilde{\alpha}_n=\tilde{\beta}_n=\operatorname{Ad}\tilde{u}_n$, we have $c_t(n)=c_t^\alpha(n)=c_t^\beta(n)$. Take $z(p,q)\in U(Z(\tilde{M}))$ such that $d_1^\alpha(p,q,r)=d_1^\beta(p,q,r)\partial(z)$ and $d_2^\alpha(s;q,r)=d_2^\beta(s;q,r)z(q,r)\theta_s(z(q,r)^*)$. Since $\mathrm{mod}(\alpha)=\mathrm{mod}(\beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} w^\alpha(q,r)^*\theta_s(w^\alpha(q,r)) &= d_2^\alpha(s;q,r)=\mathrm{mod}(\alpha_{\widetilde{qr}})(c_s(m(q,r)))\\ &= d_2^\beta(s;q,r)=w^\beta(q,r)^*\theta_s(w^\beta(q,r)) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $z(q,r)=\theta_s(z(q,r))$ holds for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$. By the ergodicity of θ_s, $z(q,r)\in\mathbb{T}$. By replacing $v^\beta(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})$ with $z(p,q)v^\beta(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})$, we can assume $d_1^\alpha(p,q,r)=d_1^\beta(p,q,r)$.

Take $a(g,h)\in\mathbb{T}$ such that $\gamma^\alpha=\gamma^\beta\partial(a)$. By replacing $v^\beta(g,h)$ with $a(g,h)v^\beta(g,h)$, we can assume $\gamma^\alpha(g,h,k)=\gamma^\beta(g,h,k)=:\gamma(g,h,k)$. After this replacement we have $d_1^\beta=d_2^\alpha\partial(b)$, where $b(p,q)=a(\tilde{p},\tilde{q})\overline{a(\widetilde{pq},m(p,q))}$. In this stage, we have $(\lambda^\alpha,\mu^\alpha),(\lambda^\beta,\mu^\beta)\in Z(G,H;\gamma,c_t)$.

By Lemma 9.3 and the remark after Lemma 9.2, $\delta_{\lambda^\beta,\mu^\beta}=\delta_{\lambda^\alpha,\mu^\alpha}\partial(b)$. Set $\lambda=\lambda^\alpha\lambda^{\beta*}$ and $\mu=\mu^\alpha\mu^{\beta*}$. Then (λ,μ) is a usual $\mathbb{C}$-valued characteristic invariant with $\delta_{\lambda,\mu}=1$ in $H^3(Q,\mathbb{T})$. Let $\xi(g,h)$ be as in Lemma 9.4. By replacing $v^\beta(g,h)$ with $\xi(g,h)v^\beta(g,h)$, we have $(\lambda^\alpha,\mu^\alpha)=(\lambda^\beta,\mu^\beta)$. Note $\gamma(g,h,k)$ remains to be unchanged since $\xi(g,h)$ is a 2-cocycle, i.e., $\partial(\xi)=1$. Finally, $v^\alpha(m,n)=v^\beta(m,n)$ follows from the definition of $\mu^\alpha(m,n)$ and $\mu^\alpha=\mu^\beta$. □

Once we have established Lemma 9.5, we can repeat the similar argument in §3, §4 and apply the intertwining argument. (Though we can not take $v^\alpha(m,n)=1$, $m,n\in H$, in this case, this does not make any problem.) Then we get $\alpha_{\tilde{p}}\equiv\sigma\circ\beta_{\tilde{p}}\circ\sigma^{-1}\mod\mathrm{Int}(M)$ for some $\sigma\in\overline{\mathrm{Int}}(M)$, and therefore $\alpha_g\equiv\sigma\circ\beta_g\circ\sigma^{-1}\mod\mathrm{Int}(M)$.

A Proof of Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 5.1

In this appendix, we present the proof of Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 5.1.

In [32, Proposition 7.4], Ocneanu proved the second cohomology vanishing theorem for semiliftable and *strongly free* actions of a discrete amenable group on M_ω by means of the Rohlin theorem. However if we use the ultraproduct technique, we can present a simple proof of the second cohomology vanishing theorem for semiliftable cocycle crossed actions on an ultraproduct algebra without use of the Rohlin type theorem.

Lemma A.1 *Let* R *be a (not necessary separable) von Neumann algebra of type* II_1 *with a tracial state* τ*,* Q *a discrete amenable group,* $(\alpha,u(g,h))$ *a cocycle crossed action of* Q *on* R*. Then for any finite subset* $F\subset Q$ *and* $\varepsilon>0$*, there exist unitaries* $\{w_g\}_{g\in Q}\subset R$ *such that* $|w_g\alpha_g(w_h)u(g,h)w_{gh}^*-1|_1<\varepsilon$ *for* $g,h\in F$.

Proof. Let S be an $(F\cup F^2,\varepsilon/2)$-invariant subset of Q. For $g\in Q$, we define a bijection $\ell(g)$ on S so that $\ell(g)h=gh$ if $gh\in S$. Fix a system of matrix units $\{e_{g,h}\}_{g,h\in S}\subset R$ and set $N=\{e_{g,h}\}'\cap R$. We identify R with $N\otimes\{e_{g,h}\}''$. Fix a unitary u_g such that $\mathrm{Ad}\,u_g\circ\alpha_g(e_{h,k})=e_{h,k}$. By replacing $\{\alpha,u(g,h)\}$ with $\{\mathrm{Ad}\,u_g\circ\alpha_g,u_g\alpha_g(u_h)u(g,h)u_{gh}^*\}$, we may assume $(\alpha,u(g,h))$ is of the form $(\alpha_g\otimes\mathrm{id},u(g,h)\otimes 1)$ on $N\otimes\{e_{g,h}\}''$. Set $w_g=\sum_{h\in S}u(g,h)^*\otimes e_{\ell(g)h,h}$. For $g,h\in Q$, set $S_{g,h}=S\cap h^{-1}S\cap(gh)^{-1}S$. By the choice of S, we have $|S\backslash S_{g,h}|\leq\varepsilon|S|/2$, $g,h\in F$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&w_g\alpha_g(w_h)(u(g,h)\otimes 1)w_{gh}^*\\
&\quad=\left(\sum_{k\in S}u(g,k)^*\otimes e_{\ell(g)k,k}\right)\left(\sum_{l\in S}\alpha_g(u(h,l)^*)\otimes e_{\ell(h)l,l}\right)\\
&\qquad\times(u(g,h)\otimes 1)\left(\sum_{m\in S}u(gh,m)\otimes e_{m,\ell(gh)m}\right)\\
&\quad=\sum_{l\in S}u(g,\ell(h)l)^*\alpha_g(u(h,l)^*)u(g,h)u(gh,l)\otimes e_{\ell(g)\ell(h)l,\ell(gh)l}\\
&\quad=\sum_{l\in S_{g,h}}1\otimes e_{ghl,ghl}+\sum_{l\in S\backslash S_{g,h}}u(g,\ell(h)l)^*\alpha_g(u(h,l)^*)u(g,h)u(gh,l)\otimes e_{\ell(g)\ell(h)l,\ell(gh)l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|w_g\alpha_g(w_h)u(g,h)w_{gh}^*-1|_1\leq\sum_{l\in S\backslash S_{g,h}}|1\otimes e_{l,l}|_1+\sum_{l\in S\backslash S_{g,h}}|1\otimes e_{\ell(g)\ell(h)l,\ell(gh)l}|_1\leq\varepsilon$$

for $g,h\in F$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.5. Let F_n be a finite subset of Q with $F_n\subset F_{n+1}$ and $\bigcup_n F_n=Q$. By Lemma A.1, there exist unitaries $\{w_g^n\}$ such that $|w_g^n\alpha_g(w_h^n)u(g,h)w_{gh}^{n*}-1|_1<1/n$ for $g,h\in F_n$. Set $u^n(g,h)=w_g^n\alpha_g(w_h^n)u(g,h)w_{gh}^{n*}$. Then $\lim_n u^n(g,h)=1$. By the Index Selection Trick [32, Lemma 5.5], we get desired unitaries $\{w_g\}\subset M_\omega$. □

Next we present the proof of Theorem 5.1, which is simplification of that of [32, Theorem 6.1]. Suppose a countable subset $N\subset M_\omega$ is given. We may assume N is invariant under γ. Then γ becomes a free proper action of K on $N'\cap M_\omega$.

The following lemma due to Ocneanu [32, Lemma 6.3] is out starting point.

Lemma A.2 *Let $\varepsilon>0$ and $T\Subset K$ be such that $e\notin T$. Then there exists a partition of unity $\{e_j\}_{j=0}^m\subset N'\cap M_\omega$ such that*
(1) $|e_0|_1\leq\varepsilon$,
(2) $e_i\gamma_g(e_i)=0$, $1\leq i\leq m$, $g\in T$.

Take F,S,δ be as in Theorem 5.1. Let $E=\{E_h\}_{h\in S}\subset N'\cap M_\omega$ be a set of mutually orthogonal projections. We set

$$a_{g,E}=\sum_{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S}|\gamma_g(E_h)-E_{gh}|_1,\ b_E=\sum_{h\in S}|E_h|_1,\ c_{g,E}=\sum_{h\in S\backslash g^{-1}S}|E_h|_1.$$

Lemma A.3 *Let* $E = \{E_h\}_{h\in S} \subset N' \cap M_\omega$ *be a set of mutually orthogonal projections with* $[\gamma_g(E_h), E_k] = 0$, $g \in F$, $h, k \in S$. *If* $b_E < 1 - \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$, *then there exists a set of mutually orthogonal projections* $E' = \{E'_h\}_{h\in S} \subset N' \cap M_\omega$ *such that*

(1) $0 < 2^{-1}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{h\in S} |E'_h - E_h|_1 \le b_{E'} - b_E$,

(2) $a_{g,E'} - a_{g,E} \le 2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(b_{E'} - b_E)$, $g \in F$,

(3) $c_{g,E'} - c_{g,E} \le 2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(b_{E'} - b_E)$, $g \in F$,

(4) $[\gamma_g(E'_h), E'_k] = 0$, $g \in F, h, k \in S$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ with $b_E < (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})(1-\varepsilon)$. By applying Lemma A.2 for $(FS)^{-1}FS\backslash\{e\}$, we get a partition of unity $\{e_j\}_{j=0}^m$ in $N' \cap \{\gamma_g(E_h)\}'_{g\in K, h\in S} \cap M_\omega$ such that $|e_0|_1 < \varepsilon$ and $\gamma_g(e_j)\gamma_h(e_j) = 0$, $1 \le j \le m$, $g, h \in FS$, $g \ne h$.

Set $x = |S|^{-1}\sum_{g,h\in S} \gamma_g^{-1}(E_h)$. Then $|x|_1 = \tau_\omega(x) = b_E$. Here assume that $|e_jx|_1 \ge (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})|e_j|_1$ for $1 \le j \le m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} b_E &= |x|_1 \ge |(1-e_0)x|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^m |e_jx|_1 \ge \sum_{j=1}^m (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})|e_j|_1 \\ &= (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})|1-e_0|_1 \ge (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})(1-\varepsilon) > b_E \end{aligned}$$

holds by the choice of ε. Hence we have $|e_jx|_1 < (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})|e_j|_1$ for some j. Set $f = e_j$, $\tilde{f} = \sum_{g\in S}\gamma_g(f)$, and $\rho = |\tilde{f}|_1 = |S||f|_1$. Since $|fx|_1 < (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})|f|_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\tilde{f}\sum_{h\in S} E_h\right|_1 &= \sum_{g\in S}\left|\gamma_g(f)\sum_{h\in S}E_h\right|_1 = \sum_{g\in S}\left|f\sum_{h\in S}\gamma_g^{-1}(E_h)\right|_1 \\ &= |S||fx|_1 < |S|(1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})|f|_1 \le (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\rho \end{aligned}$$

holds.

Set $f_h = \gamma_h(f)$, and $E'_h = E_h(1-\tilde{f}) + \gamma_h(f)$. We show $E'_h \ne E_h$. If we assume $E'_h = E_h$, then we get $\gamma_h(f) = E_h\tilde{f}$. However this is impossible because we have

$$(1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\rho > \sum_{h\in S}|\tilde{f}E_h|_1 = \sum_{h\in S}|\gamma_h(f)|_1 = \rho.$$

Since $\{\gamma_g(f_h)\}$ are orthogonal projections for $g \in F, h \in S$, commute with $\gamma_g(E_h)$ and $[\gamma_g(E_h), E_k] = 0$, it follows that $[\gamma_g(E'_h), E'_k] = 0$ for $g \in F$, $h, k \in S$.

We first verify the condition (1). Since

$$\sum_{h\in S}|E'_h - E_h|_1 = \sum_{h\in S}|E_h\tilde{f} - f_h|_1 \le |\tilde{f}|_1 + \sum_{h\in S}|f_h|_1 \le 2\rho$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b_{E'} &= \sum_{h\in S}|E'_h|_1 = \sum_{h\in S}|E_h(1-\tilde{f}) + f_h|_1 = \sum_{h\in S}|E_h|_1 + \sum_{h\in S}|f_h|_1 - \sum_{h\in S}|E_h\tilde{f}|_1 \\ &\ge b_E + \rho - (1-\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\rho = b_E + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$b'_E - b_E \geq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho \geq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}/2\sum_{h\in S}|E'_h - E_h|_1,$$

and we get the condition (1).

We next verify the condition (2). For $h \in S\cap g^{-1}S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\gamma_g(E'_h) - E'_{gh}|_1 &= |\gamma_g(E_h(1-\tilde{f}) + f_h) - E_{gh}(1-\tilde{f}) - f_{gh}|_1 \\
&= |\gamma_g(E_h(1-\tilde{f})) - E_{gh}(1-\tilde{f})|_1 \\
&\leq |\gamma_g(E_h)(1-\tilde{f}) - E_{gh}(1-\tilde{f})|_1 + |\gamma_g(E_h)(\tilde{f} - \gamma_g(\tilde{f}))|_1 \\
&\leq |\gamma_g(E_h) - E_{gh}|_1 + |\gamma_g(E_h)(\tilde{f} - \gamma_g(\tilde{f}))|_1
\end{aligned}$$

holds. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{g,E'} &= \sum_{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S}|\gamma_g(E'_h) - E'_{gh}|_1 \\
&\leq \sum_{h\in S\cap g^{-1}S}|\gamma_g(E_h) - E_{gh}|_1 + |\gamma_g(E_h)(\tilde{f} - \gamma_g(\tilde{f}))|_1 \\
&\leq a_{g,E} + |\tilde{f} - \gamma_g(\tilde{f})|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$|\tilde{f} - \gamma_g(\tilde{f})|_1 = \left|\sum_{h\in S}\gamma_h(f) - \sum_{h\in S}\gamma_g\gamma_h(f)\right|_1 \leq \sum_{h\in S\triangle gS}|\gamma_h(f)|_1 \leq 2\delta|S||f|_1 = 2\delta\rho$$

holds. These inequalities yield

$$a_{g,E'} - a_{g,E} \leq 2\delta\rho \leq 2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(b_{E'} - b_E),$$

and the condition (2) holds.

We finally verify the condition (3). Since we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{g,E'} &= \sum_{h\in S\backslash g^{-1}S}|E'_h|_1 \\
&= \sum_{h\in k\backslash g^{-1}S}|E_h(1-\tilde{f})|_1 + \sum_{h\in S\backslash g^{-1}S}|\gamma_h(f)|_1 \\
&\leq c_{g,E} + |S\backslash g^{-1}S||f|_1 \\
&\leq c_{g,E} + 2\delta|S||f|_1 \\
&\leq c_{g,E} + 2\delta\rho \\
&\leq c_{g,E} + 2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(b_{E'} - b_E),
\end{aligned}$$

we get the condition (3) □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of families of orthogonal projections $E = \{E_h\}_{h\in S}$ in $N'\cap M_\omega$ satisfying the following conditions.

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1) \quad a_{g,E} \leq 2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}b_E, \quad g\in F, \\
&(2) \quad c_{g,E} \leq 2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}b_E, \quad g\in F, \\
&(3) \quad [\gamma_g(E_h), E_k] = 0, \quad g\in F,\ h,k\in S.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously $\mathcal{S}$ is not empty. We define an order $E \leq E'$ on $\mathcal{S}$ if $E = E'$ or E and E' satisfy the first three conditions in Lemma A.3. In the same way as in [32], it is shown that $\mathcal{S}$ is an inductive ordered set. Let $\bar{E} = \{\bar{E}_h\}$ be a maximal element, and assume $b_{\bar{E}} < 1 - \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By Lemma A.3, there exists a partition of unity $\{E'_h\}$ satisfying the conditions in Lemma A.3. Then it is easy to see $\{E'_h\}$ is in $\mathcal{S}$, and $\{E'_h\}$ is strictly larger than $\bar{E}$.

Hence $b_{\bar{E}} \geq 1 - \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ holds. Let $E_0 = 1 - \sum_{h \in S} \bar{E}_h$. Then $|E_0|_1 \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Fix $h_0 \in S$, and set $E_{h_0} = \bar{E}_{h_0} + E_0$, and $E_h = \bar{E}_h$ for $h \neq h_0$. It is obvious $[\gamma_g(E_h), E_k] = 0$, $g \in F$, $h, k \in S$. It is also easy to see $a_{g,E} \leq 4\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $c_{g,E} \leq 3\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$. □

B Extension of automorphisms to a twisted crossed product algebra

Let M be a von Neumann algebra, and $L^2(M)$ the standard Hilbert space. Let $(\alpha_g, v(g,h))$ be a cocycle crossed action of G. Define $\pi(x), \lambda_g \in B(L^2(M) \otimes \ell^2(G))$, $x \in M$, $g \in G$, as follows. (Do not confuse $\alpha_{g^{-1}}$ and α_g^{-1}.)

$$(\pi(x)\xi)(g) = \alpha_{g^{-1}}(x)\xi(g),\ (\lambda_g \xi)(h) = v(h^{-1}, g)\xi(g^{-1}h).$$

Then $\lambda_g \pi(x) \lambda_g^* = \pi(\alpha_g(x))$ and $\lambda_g \lambda_h = \pi(v(g,h))\lambda_{gh}$ hold. By definition, the twisted crossed product von Neumann algebra is $M \rtimes_{\alpha,v} G = \pi(M) \vee \{\lambda_g\}$.

Although the following result may be well-known, we present a proof for readers' convenience.

Theorem B.1 (1) *Assume that* $\theta \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *induces an automorphism on* G *(denoted by the same symbol* θ*) such that*

$$\theta \circ \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(g)} \circ \theta^{-1} = \mathrm{Ad}\, u_g^\theta \circ \alpha_g(x),\ u_g^\theta \alpha_g(u_h^\theta) v(g,h) u_{gh}^{\theta *} = \theta(v(\theta^{-1}(g), \theta^{-1}(h)))$$

for some unitary $u_g^\theta \in M$. *Then there exists a unique extension* $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathrm{Aut}(M \rtimes_{\alpha,v} G)$ *of* θ *such that* $\theta(\lambda_{\theta^{-1}(g)}) = \pi(u_g^\theta)\lambda_g$.
(2) *If we have* $u_g^{\theta\sigma} = \theta(u^\sigma_{\theta^{-1}(g)}) u_g^\theta$ *for* $\theta, \sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)$, *then* $\tilde{\theta} \circ \tilde{\sigma} = \widetilde{\theta \circ \sigma}$ *holds.*

Proof. (1) Denote u_g^θ by u_g for simplicity. Let $U_\theta \in B(L^2(M))$ be the standard implementing unitary of θ. Define a unitary $W_\theta \in B(L^2(M) \otimes \ell^2(G))$ by

$$(W_\theta \xi)(g) = u_{g^{-1}}^* U_\theta \xi(\theta^{-1}(g)),\ \ \xi(g) \in L^2(M) \otimes \ell^2(G).$$

Then W_θ^* is given by

$$(W_\theta \xi)(\theta^{-1}(g)) = U_\theta^* u_{g^{-1}} \xi(g).$$

We show $\mathrm{Ad}\, W_\theta$ gives a desired action. At first, we verify $\mathrm{Ad}\, W_\theta(\pi(a)) = \pi(\theta(a))$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
(W_\theta \pi(a) W_\theta^* \xi)(g) &= u_{g^{-1}}^* U_\theta (\pi(a) W_\theta^* \xi)(\theta^{-1}(g)) \\
&= u_{g^{-1}}^* U_\theta \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(g^{-1})}(a) (W_\theta^* \xi)(\theta^{-1}(g)) \\
&= u_{g^{-1}}^* U_\theta \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(g^{-1})}(a) U_\theta^* u_{g^{-1}} \xi(g) \\
&= u_{g^{-1}}^* \theta \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(g^{-1})}(a) u_{g^{-1}} \xi(g) \\
&= \alpha_{g^{-1}}(\theta(a)) \xi(g) \\
&= (\pi(\theta(a))\xi)(g).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we show $\mathrm{Ad}\, W_\theta(\lambda_{\theta^{-1}(g)}) = \pi(u_g)\lambda_g$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(W_\theta \lambda_{\theta^{-1}(g)} W_\theta^* \xi\right)(h) &= u_{h^{-1}}^* U_\theta \left(\lambda_g W_\theta^* \xi\right)\left(\theta^{-1}(h)\right) \\
&= u_{h^{-1}}^* U_\theta \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(h^{-1})} \left(v(\theta^{-1}(h^{-1}), \theta^{-1}(g))\right) \left(W_\theta^* \xi\right)\left(\theta^{-1}(g^{-1}h)\right) \\
&= u_{h^{-1}}^* U_\theta \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(h^{-1})} \left(v(\theta^{-1}(h^{-1}), \theta^{-1}(g))\right) U_\theta^* u_{h^{-1}g} \xi(g^{-1}h) \\
&= u_{h^{-1}}^* \theta \alpha_{\theta^{-1}(h^{-1})} \left(v(\theta^{-1}(h^{-1}), \theta^{-1}(g))\right) u_{h^{-1}g} \xi(g^{-1}h) \\
&= u_{h^{-1}}^* u_{h^{-1}} \alpha_{h^{-1}}(u_g) v(h^{-1}, g) \xi(g^{-1}h) \\
&= \alpha_{h^{-1}}(u_g) \left(\lambda_g \xi\right)(h) \\
&= \left(\pi(u_g)\lambda_g \xi\right)(h).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\tilde{\theta} = \mathrm{Ad}\, W_\theta$ preserves $M \rtimes_{\alpha,v} G$, and is a desired extension. The uniqueness of $\tilde{\theta}$ is obvious.
(2) By the assumption, $W_\theta W_\sigma = W_{\theta\sigma}$ holds. $\square$

References

[1] Choda, M. and Kosaki, H., *Strongly outer actions for an inclusion of factors*, J. Funct. Anal. **122** (1994), 315–332.

[2] Connes, A., *Almost periodic states and factors of type III_1*, J. Funct. Anal. **16** (1974), 415–445.

[3] Connes, A., *Outer conjugacy classes of automorphisms of factors*, Ann. Sci. Eco. Norm. Sup. **8** (1975), 383–420.

[4] Connes, A., *Classification of injective factors*, Ann. Math. **104** (1976), 73–115.

[5] Connes, A., *On the classification of von Neumann algebras and their automorphisms*, Symp. Math. **XX** (1976), 435–478.

[6] Connes, A., *Periodic automorphisms of the hyperfinite factor of type II_1*, Acta Sci. Math **39** (1977), 39–66.

[7] Connes, A., *Type III_1 factors, property L'_λ and closure of inner automorphisms*, J. Operator Theory **14** (1985), 189–211.

[8] Connes, A. and Takesaki, M., *The flow of weights on factors of type III*, Tohoku J. Math. **29** (1977), 473–555.

[9] Evans, D. E. and Kishimoto, A., *Trace scaling automorphisms of certain stable AF algebras*, Hokkaido Math J. **26** (1997), 211–224.

[10] Falcone, T. and Takesaki, M., *The non-commutative flow of weights on a von Neumann algebra*, J. Funct. Anal. **182** (2001), 170–206.

[11] Goto, S., *Commutativity of automorphisms of subfactors modulo inner automorphisms*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **124** (1996), 3391–3398.

[12] Haagerup, U., *Connes' bicentralizer problem and uniqueness of the injective factor of type III_1*, Acta Math. **158** (1987), 95–148.

[13] Haagerup, U. and Størmer, E., *Equivalence of normal states on von Neumann algebras and the flow of weights*, Adv. Math. **83** (1990), 180–262.

[14] J. Huebschmann, *Group extensions, crossed pairs and an eight term exact sequence*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **321** (1981), 150–172.

[15] Jones, V. F. R., *A factor anti-isomorphic to itself but without involutory anti-automorphisms*, Math. Scan. **46** (1980), 103–117.

[16] Jones, V. F. R., *Actions of finite groups on the hyperfinite type II_1 factor*, Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc **237** (1980).

[17] Jones, V. F. R., *Index for subfactors*, Invent. Math. **72** (1983), 1–25.

[18] Jones, V. F. R. and Takesaki, M., *Actions of compact abelian groups on semifinite injective factors*, Acta Math. **153** (1984), 213–258.

[19] Katayama, Y., Sutherland, C. E., and Takesaki, M., *The characteristic square of a factor and the cocycle conjugacy of discrete group actions on factors*, Invent. Math. **132** (1998), 331–380.

[20] Katayama, Y. and Takesaki, M., *Outer actions of a discrete amenable group on approximately finite dimensional factors, I, General theory*, Operator algebras, quantization, and noncommutative geometry, Contemp. Math., vol. 365, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2004), 181–237.

[21] Kawahigashi, Y., *Classification of approximately inner automorphisms of subfactors*, Math. Ann. **138** (1997), 425–438.

[22] Kawahigashi, Y., Sutherland, C. E., and Takesaki, M., *The structure of the automorphism group of an injective factor and the cocycle conjugacy of discrete abelian group actions*, Acta Math. **169** (1992), 105–130.

[23] Kawahigashi, Y. and Takesaki, M., *Compact abelian group actions on injective factors*, J. Funct. Anal. **105** (1992), 112–128.

[24] Krieger, W., *On ergodic flows and the isomorphism of factors*, Math. Annal. **223** (1976), 19–70.

[25] Loi, P., *On automorphisms of subfactors*, J. Funct. Anal. **141** (1996), 275–293.

[26] Masuda, T., *Notes on group actions on subfactors*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **55** (2003), 1–11.

[27] Masuda, T., *An analogue of Connes-Haagerup approach to classification of subfactors of type III_1*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **57** (2005), 959–1003.

[28] Masuda, T., *Classification of approximately inner actions of discrete amenable groups on strongly amenable subfactors*, Internat. J. Math. **16** (2005), 1193–1206.

[29] Masuda, T., *Evans-Kishimoto type argument for actions of discrete amenable groups on McDuff factors*, Math. Scand. **101** (2007), 48–64.

[30] Masuda, T. and Tomatsu, R., *Classification of minimal actions of a compact Kac algebra with amenable dual*, Comm. Math. Phys. **274** (2007), 487–551.

[31] McDuff, D., *Central sequences and the hyperfinite factor*, Proc. London. Math. Soc. **21** (1970), 443–461.

[32] Ocneanu, A., *Action of discrete amenable groups on von Neumann algebras*, vol. 1138, Springer, Berlin, (1985).

[33] Popa, S., *Classification of amenable subfactor of type II*, Acta Math. **172** (1994), 163–255.

[34] Popa, S., *Classification of actions of discrete amenable groups on amenable subfactors of type II*, to appear in Internat. J. Math.

[35] J. G. Ratcliffe, *Crossed extensions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **257** (1980), 73–89.

[36] Sekine, Y., *Flow of weights of the crossed products of type III factors by discrete groups*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **26** (1990), 655–666.

[37] Sutherland, C. E., *Extensions of von Neumann algebras, II*, Publ. Res. Inst.Math. Sci. **16** (1980), 135–174.

[38] Sutherland, C. E. and Takesaki, M, *Actions of discrete amenable groups and groupoids on von Neumann algebras*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **21** (1985), 1087–1120.

[39] Sutherland, C. E. and Takesaki, M., *Actions of discrete amenable groups on injective factors of type* III_λ, $\lambda \neq 1$, Pacific. J. Math. **137** (1989), 405–444.

[40] Sutherland, C. E. and Takesaki, M., *Right inverse of the module of approximately finite-dimensional factors of type III and approximately finite ergodic principal measured groupoids*, Operator algebras and their applications, II (Waterloo, ON, 1994/1995), Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 20, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1998), 149–159.

[41] Takesaki, M., *Theory of Operator Algebras, I, II, III*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, (2002).